arXiv:1003.0613v1 [math.OA] 2 Mar 2010

TWISTED ACTIONS AND REGULAR FELL BUNDLES OVER INVERSE SEMIGROUPS

ALCIDES BUSS AND RUY EXEL

Abstract. We introduce a new notion of twisted actions of inverse semigroups and show that they correspond bijectively to certain *regular* Fell bundles over inverse semigroups, yielding in this way a structure classification of such bundles. These include as special cases all the *stable* Fell bundles.

Our definition of twisted actions properly generalizes a previous one introduced by Sieben and corresponds to Busby-Smith twisted actions in the group case. As an application we describe twisted étale groupoid C^*-algebras in terms of crossed products by twisted actions of inverse semigroups and show that Sieben's twisted actions essentially correspond to twisted étale groupoids with topologically trivial twists.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Regular ternary rings and imprimitivity bimodules 4
3. Regular Fell bundles 9
4. Twisted actions 13
5. Relation to Sieben's twisted actions 20
6. Representations and crossed products 22
7. Relation to twisted groupoids 25
8. Refinements of Fell bundles 28
References 35

1. Introduction

In [7] the second named author introduced a method for constructing a Fell bundle (also called a C^*-algebraic bundle [10]) over a group G, starting from a *twisted partial action* of G on a C^*-algebra. The relevance of this construction is due to the fact that a very large number of Fell bundles, including all stable, second countable ones, arise from a twisted partial action of the base group on the unit fiber algebra [7, Theorem 7.3]. It is the purpose of the present article to extend the above ideas in order to embrace Fell bundles over *inverse semigroups*.

The notion of Fell bundles over inverse semigroups was introduced by Sieben [24] and further developed in [9] and [3]. Among its important occurrences one has that every twisted étale groupoid or, more generally, every Fell bundle over an étale groupoid (in the sense of Kumjian [13]) gives rise to a Fell bundle over the inverse semigroup of its open bisections (see [3, Example 2.11]).

Given a Fell bundle $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ over an inverse semigroup S, one says that $\mathcal{A}$ is *saturated* if $\mathcal{A}_{st}$ coincides with the closed linear span of $\mathcal{A}_s\mathcal{A}_t$ for all s and t

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46L55, 20M18.

Key words and phrases. Fell bundle, inverse semigroup, ternary ring, twisted action, twisted groupoid, crossed product.

This research was partially supported by CNPq.

in S. The requirement that a Fell bundle over an inverse semigroup be saturated is not as severe as in the case of groups because in the former situation one may apply the process of *refinement* (see Section 8), transforming any Fell bundle into a saturated one (albeit over a different inverse semigroup). We will therefore mostly restrict our attention to saturated Fell bundles.

Both in the case of groups and of inverse semigroups each fiber of a Fell bundle possesses the structure of a *ternary ring of operators* (see [25], [7, Section 4]), namely a mathematical structure isomorphic to a closed linear space of operators on a Hilbert space which is invariant under the ternary operation

$$(x, y, z) \mapsto xy^*z.$$

Under special circumstances (see Definition 2.2 below or [7, Section 5]) a ternary ring of operators M admits a partial isometry u (acting on the Hilbert space where M is represented) such that $M^*u = M^*M$, and $uM^* = MM^*$, in which case we say that u is *associated to* M and that M is regular.

Likewise, given a Fell bundle $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ over an inverse semigroup S, we say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *regular* if every $\mathcal{A}_s$ is regular as a ternary ring of operators. Assuming this is the case, one may consequently choose a family of partial isometries $\{u_s\}_{s\in S}$, where each u_s is associated to $\mathcal{A}_s$. These give rise to two important families of objects, namely the automorphisms

$$\beta_s \colon a \in \mathcal{A}_{s^*s} \mapsto u_s a u_s^* \in \mathcal{A}_{ss^*}, \tag{1.1}$$

and the *cocycle* $\omega = \{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}$, given by

$$\omega(s,t) = u_s u_t u_{st}^*. \tag{1.2}$$

Although the partial isometries u_s live outside our Fell bundle, the presence of the β_s and of the $\omega(s,t)$ is felt at the level of the fibers over idempotent elements of S: this is obviously so with respect to β_s, as its domain and range are fibers over idempotents, and one may show that $\omega(s,t)$ is nothing but a unitary multiplier of the fiber over the idempotent element $st(st)^*$.

The main point of departure for our research was the challenge of identifying a suitable set of properties satisfied by the β_s and the $\omega(s,t)$ which, when taken as axioms referring to abstractly given collections $\{\beta_s\}_{s\in S}$ and $\{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}$, could be used to construct a Fell bundle over S. The properties we decided to pick are to be found in Definition 4.1 below, describing our notion of a *twisted action of an inverse semigroup*.

Returning to the β_s and the $\omega(s,t)$ of (1.1) and (1.2), there is in fact a myriad of algebraic relations which can be proven for these, a sample of which is listed under Proposition 3.6. Having as our main goal to generalize the group case of [7], we were happy to welcome into our definition two of the main axioms adopted in the group case [7, Definition 2.1], namely properties (iv) and (v) of Proposition 3.6.

However, choosing the appropriate replacement for [7, Definition 2.1.d], namely

$$\omega(t,e) = \omega(e,t) = 1, \tag{1.3}$$

where e denotes the unit of the group, turned out to be a major difficulty. Nonetheless this dilemma proved to be the gateway to interesting and profound phenomena relating, among other things, to topological aspects of twisted groupoids, as we hope to be able to convey below.

Sieben [23] has considered a similar notion of twisted action, where he postulates (1.3) for every t and e in S, such that e is idempotent. Although this may be justified by the fact that the idempotents of S play a role similar to the unit in a group, it cannot be proved in the model situation where the $\omega(s,t)$ are given by (1.2), so we decided not to adopt it.

After groping our way in the dark for quite some time (at one point we had an untold number of strange looking axioms) we settled for (iii) and (iv) in Definition 4.1 which the reader may still find a bit awkward but which precisely fulfills our expectations.

Needless to say, regular Fell bundles over an inverse semigroup S are then shown to be in a one-to-one correspondence with twisted actions of S, as proven in Corollary 4.16, hence providing the desired generalization of the main result of [7].

Sieben's condition (1.3), although not satisfactory for our goals, is quite relevant in a number of ways. Among other things it implies our axioms and hence Sieben's definition [23] of twisted actions is a special case of ours (see Proposition 5.1).

As our main application we consider an important class of Fell bundles over inverse semigroups, obtained from twisted groupoids [12, Section 2], [21, Section 4]. Given an étale groupoid $\mathcal{G}$ equipped with a twist Σ, one may consider the associated complex line bundle $L = (\Sigma \times \mathbb{C})/\mathbb{T}$ [4, Example 5.5], which is a Fell bundle over $\mathcal{G}$ in the sense of [13]. Therefore, applying the procedure outlined in [3, Example 2.11] to $(\mathcal{G}, L)$, we may form a Fell bundle $\{\mathcal{A}_s\}_s$, over the inverse semigroup of all open bisections $s \subseteq \mathcal{G}$.

En passant, the class of such Fell bundles consists precisely of the *semi-abelian* ones, namely those having commutative fibers over idempotent semigroup elements [3, Theorem 3.36].

Recall from [3, Example 2.11] that for each bisection $s \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{A}_s$ is defined as the space of all continuous sections of L over s vanishing at infinity. Regularity being the key hypothesis of our main Theorem, one should ask whether or not $\mathcal{A}_s$ is regular. The answer is affirmative when L is topologically trivial over s, because one may then choose a nonvanishing continuous section over s which turns out to be associated to $\mathcal{A}_s$.

Restricting our Fell bundle to a subsemigroup consisting of *small* bisections, i.e. bisections where L is topologically trivial (recall that L is necessarily locally trivial), we get a regular one to which we may apply our main result, describing the bundle in question in terms of a twisted inverse semigroup action.

As an immediate consequence (Theorem 7.2) we prove that the twisted groupoid C^*-algebra is isomorphic to the crossed product of $\mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big)$ by a twisted inverse semigroup action. This simultaneously generalizes [17, Theorem 3.3.1], [18, Theorem 8.1] and [8, Theorem 9.9].

Still speaking of Fell bundles arising from a twisted groupoid, we found a very nice characterization of Sieben's condition (Proposition 7.4): it holds if and only if the line bundle L is topologically trivial (although it needs not be trivial as a Fell bundle).

Our method sheds new light over the historic evolution of the notion of *twisted groupoids*. Indeed, recall that Renault [20] first viewed twisted groupoids as those equipped with continuous two-cocycles, although more recently the most widely accepted notion of a twist over a groupoid is that of a groupoid extension

$$\mathbb{T} \times \mathcal{G}^{(0)} \to \Sigma \to \mathcal{G}$$

[12, Section 2], [15, Section 2], [21, Section 4]. While a two-cocycle is known to give rise to a groupoid extension, the converse is not true, the obstruction being that Σ may be topologically nontrivial as a circle bundle over $\mathcal{G}$ [15, Example 2.1].

Our point of view, based on inverse semigroups, may be seen as unifying the *cocycle* and the *extension* points of view, because the Fell bundle over the inverse semigroup of *small* bisections may always be described by a *cocycle*, namely the $\omega(s,t)$ of our twisted action, even when the twist itself is topologically nontrivial and hence does not come from a 2-cocycle in Renault's sense. Nevertheless, when a

twisted étale groupoid does come from a 2-cocycle τ in Renault's sense, then there is a close relationship between τ and our cocycle ω (Proposition 7.7)

Most of our results are based on the regularity property of Fell bundles but in some cases we can do without it. The key idea behind this generalization is based on the notion of *refinement* (see Definition 8.1). In topology it is often the case that assertions fail to hold globally, while holding locally. In many of these circumstances one may successfully proceed after restricting oneself to a covering of the space formed by small open sets where the assertion in question holds. The idea of Fell bundle refinement is the inverse semigroup equivalent of this procedure.

Although the process of refining a Fell bundle changes everything, including the base inverse semigroup, the cross-sectional algebras are unchanged (Theorem 8.4), as one would expect. Moreover, if a semi-abelian Fell bundle $\mathcal{A}$ admits $\mathcal{B}$ as a refinement, then the underlying twisted groupoids $(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}})$ obtained by [3, Section 3.2] are isomorphic (Proposition 8.10).

A ternary ring of operators is said to be *locally regular* if it generated by its regular ideals (Definition (2.8)). Likewise a Fell bundle over an inverse semigroup is said to be *locally regular* if its fibers are locally regular as ternary rings of operators.

Our main reason for considering locally regular Fell bundles is that all semi-abelian ones possess this property (Proposition 2.9). Furthermore, our motivation for studying the notion of refinement is that every locally regular bundle admits a saturated regular refinement (Proposition 8.6), even if the original bundle is not saturated. Therefore the scope of our theory is extended to include all locally regular bundles.

2. Regular ternary rings and imprimitivity bimodules

In this section we shall study a special class of ternary rings and imprimitivity bimodules named *regular*. This notion, which is the basis for our future considerations, has been first introduced in [7] building on ideas from [1].

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space, and let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the space of all bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Recall that a ternary ring of operators is a closed subspace $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $MM^*M \subseteq M$. It is a consequence that $MM^*M = M$ (see [7, Corollary 4.10]), where MM^*M means the closed linear span of $\{xy^*z \colon x, y, z \in M\}$. Moreover, it is easy to see that M^*M and MM^* (closed linear spans) are C^*-subalgebras of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. We refer to [7] and [25] for more details on ternary rings.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a ternary ring of operators and let $u \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Consider the following properties*:

(a) $M^*u = M^*M$;
(b) $uM^* = MM^*$;
(c) $uu^*M = M$;
(d) $Mu^*u = M$.

Then
(i) (a) *and* (b) *imply* (c);
(ii) (a) *and* (b) *imply* (d);
(iii) (a) *and* (c) *imply* (b);
(iv) (b) *and* (d) *imply* (c).

Proof. (i) $uu^*M = uM^*M = MM^*M = M$.
(ii) $Mu^*u = MM^*u = MM^*M = M$.
(iii) $uM^* = uM^*MM^* = uu^*MM^* = MM^*$.
(iv) $M^*u = M^*MM^*u = M^*Mu^*u = M^*M$. □

Definition 2.2. We say that a ternary ring of operators $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is regular if there is $u \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying the properties (a)-(d) of the lemma above. In this case, we say that u is *associated to* M and write $u \sim M$.

By [7, Proposition 5.3], the above definition is equivalent to Definition 5.1 in [7].

Example 2.3. Essentially, every regular ternary ring of operators $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ has the following form (this will become clearer as we proceed): suppose $B \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is a C^*-subalgebra and suppose that m is an element of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ such that m^*mB (closed linear span) is equal to B. Then it is easy to see that $M := mB$ (closed linear span) is a regular ternary ring of operators. Note that $M^*M = B$ and that $A := MM^* = uBu^*$ is a C^*-subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ which is isomorphic to B (see also Corollary 2.6 below).

Proposition 2.4. *Let $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a ternary ring of operators. Suppose $m \in M$ is associated to M and let $m = u|m|$ be the polar decomposition of m. Then u is associated to M, m^* and u^* are associated to M^*, $|m|$ and m^*m are associated to E^*E, and $|m^*|$ and mm^* are associated to MM^*.*

Proof. Since $mM^*M = M$, we get $m^*mM^*M = m^*M = M^*M$. Taking adjoints, we also get $M^*Mm^*m = M^*M$. This means that m^*m is associated to M^*M. This implies, in particular, that m^*m and hence also $|m| = (m^*m)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are multipliers of the C^*-algebra M^*M. Thus

$$|m|M^*M \subseteq M^*M = m^*mM^*M = |m|^2M^*M = |m||m|M^*M \subseteq |m|M^*M.$$

This yields $M^*M|m| = |m|M^*M = M^*M$, so that $|m|$ is associated to M^*M. Applying the involution to the properties (a)-(d) of Lemma 2.1, it is easy to see that $n \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is associated to M if and only if n^* is associated to M^*. Thus m^* is associated to M^*, and hence by the argument above, mm^* and $|m^*|$ are associated to MM^*. It remains to see that u is associated to M. We have

$$u^*M = u^*MM^*M = u^*mM^*M = |m|M^*M = M^*M$$

and (using that $um^* = |m^*|$)

$$uM^* = uM^*MM^* = um^*MM^* = |m^*|MM^* = MM^*$$

□

Notice that if $u \sim M$, then

$$MH = uM^*MH \subseteq uH \quad \text{and} \quad M^*H = u^*MM^*H \subseteq u^*H.$$

If both inclusions above are equalities, we say that u is *strictly associated to* M and write $u \overset{s}{\sim} M$. We can always assume that u is strict by replacing u by up, where p is the projection onto M^*MH. In fact, $upH = uM^*MH = MH$ and $up \sim M$ because

$$upM^* = upM^*MM^* = uM^* = MM^* \quad \text{and} \quad M^*up = M^*Mp = M^*M.$$

Given a C^*-subalgebra $A \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, we write 1_A for the unit of the multiplier C^*-algebra $\mathcal{M}(A)$ of A (which we also represent in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is the usual way).

Proposition 2.5. *Let $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a ternary ring of operators, and let $u \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a partial isometry associated to M. Then the following assertions are equivalent*:

(i) *u is strictly associated to M;*
(ii) *$MH = uH$ or $M^*H = u^*H$;*
(iii) *$u^*u = 1_{M^*M}$ and $uu^* = 1_{MM^*}$;*
(iv) *$u^*u = 1_{M^*M}$ or $uu^* = 1_{MM^*}$.*

Proof. If $uH = MH$, then $p = u^*u$ is the projection onto

$$u^*uH = u^*H = M^*H = M^*MH.$$

Thus, $px = x = xp$ for all $x \in M^*M$, so that $p = 1_{M^*M}$. Conversely, if $u^*u = 1_{M^*M}$, then

$$uH = uu^*uH = u1_{M^*M}H = uM^*MH = MM^*MH = MH.$$

Similarly, $u^*H = MH$ if and only if $uu^* = 1_{MM^*}$. Now if $MH = uH$, then

$$u^*H = u^*uu^*H = u^*MM^*H = M^*MM^*H = M^*H.$$

Similarly, if $u^*H = MH$, then $uH = MH$. All these considerations imply the equivalences (i)$\Leftrightarrow$ (ii)$\Leftrightarrow$ (iii)$\Leftrightarrow$ (iv). □

If $m = u|m|$ is the polar decomposition of an element $m \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ associated to a ternary ring of operators $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, then m is strictly associated to M if and only u is strictly associated to M. In fact, this follows from the equalities

$$uH = u|m|H = mH \quad \text{and} \quad u^*H = u^*|m^*|H = m^*H.$$

As a consequence of propositions 2.4 and 2.5, we get the following:

Corollary 2.6. *A ternary ring of operators $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is regular if and only if there is a partial isometry $u \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying*

$$uM^*M = M, \quad MM^*u = M, \quad u^*u = 1_{M^*M} \quad \textit{and} \quad uu^* = 1_{MM^*}.$$

In particular, the map $a \mapsto u^*au$ is a *-isomorphism from MM^* to M^*M.

Later, we shall need the following fact:

Proposition 2.7. *Let $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a ternary ring of operators and let $u \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be strictly associated to M. Then u lies in the weak closure of M within $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$.*

Proof. Let $\{e_i\}_i$ be an approximate unit for the C^*-algebra MM^*. We claim that $u = \lim_i e_iu$ in the strong topology of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. In order to prove this let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$. Then

$$u\xi \in u\mathcal{H} = M\mathcal{H} = MM^*M\mathcal{H} \subseteq MM^*\mathcal{H},$$

so by Cohen's Factorization Theorem, we may write $u\xi = a\eta$, with $a \in MM^*$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore

$$\lim_i e_iu\xi = \lim_i e_ia\eta = a\eta = u\xi,$$

thus proving our claim. It follows that u belongs to the weak closure of $MM^*u = MM^*M = M$. □

Let M be a ternary ring of operators. An *ideal* of M is a closed subspace $N \subseteq M$ satisfying $NM^*M \subseteq N$ and $MM^*N \subseteq N$. Alternatively, N is an ideal of M if and only if N is a sub-ternary ring of operators of M for which N^*N is an ideal of M^*M and NN^* is an ideal of MM^*. It is easy to see that our definition of ideals in ternary rings of operators is equivalent to Definition 6.1 in [7]. By Proposition 6.3 in [7], if M is a regular ternary ring of operators, then so is any ideal $N \subseteq M$. Moreover, if $u \sim M$, then $u \sim N$.

Definition 2.8. We say that a ternary ring of operators M is *locally regular* if it generated by regular ideals in the sense that there is a family $\{M_i\}_{i\in I}$ of ideals $M_i \subseteq M$ such that each M_i is a regular ternary ring of operators and

$$M = \overline{\sum_{i\in I} M_i}.$$

Proposition 2.9. *Let $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a ternary ring of operators. If $A := MM^*$ and $B := M^*M$ are commutative C^*-algebras, then M is locally regular.*

Proof. Given $m \in M$, we show that the ideal $\langle m\rangle \subseteq M$ generated by m, namely $\langle m\rangle := MM^*mM^*M$ (closed linear span) is regular. Since $B = M^*M$ is commutative, we have

$$\langle m\rangle = AmB = M(M^*m)(M^*M) = M(M^*M)(M^*m) = MM^*m = Am.$$

Similarly, since $A = MM^*$ is commutative, we have $\langle m\rangle = mB$. Since $m \in \langle m\rangle$, this implies that $\langle m\rangle$ is regular. □

Although we have chosen to work with ternary ring of operators concretely represented in Hilbert spaces, there is an abstract approach free of representations. In fact, note that a ternary ring of operators $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ may be viewed as an imprimitivity Hilbert A, B-bimodule, where $A = MM^*$ and $B = M^*M$ and the Hilbert bimodule structure (left A-action, right B-action and inner products) is given by the operations in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Conversely, any imprimitivity Hilbert A, B-bimodule $\mathcal{F}$ is isomorphic to some ternary ring of operators $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ (viewed as a bimodule). We refer the reader to [6] for more details on Hilbert modules. Given Hilbert B-modules $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$, we write $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ for the spaces of compact and adjointable operators $\mathcal{F}_1 \to \mathcal{F}_2$, respectively.

The *multiplier bimodule* of $\mathcal{F}$ is defined as $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}) := \mathcal{L}(B, \mathcal{F})$. This is, indeed, a Hilbert $\mathcal{M}(A), \mathcal{M}(B)$-bimodule with respect to the canonical structure (see [6, Section 1.5] for details).

The notion of (local) regularity defined previously may be translated to the setting of Hilbert bimodules as follows.

Definition 2.10. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an imprimitivity Hilbert A, B-bimodule. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ *regular* if there is a unitary multiplier $u \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$, that is, an adjointable operator $u\colon B \to \mathcal{F}$ such that $u^*u = 1_B$ and $uu^* = 1_A$ (here we tacitly identify $\mathcal{M}(A) \cong \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}) \cong \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}))$ in the usual way). We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is *locally regular* if it is generated by regular sub-A, B-bimodules, that is, if there is a family $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i\in I}$ of sub-A, B-bimodules $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that each $\mathcal{F}_i$ is is regular as an imprimitivity A_i, B_i-bimodule, where $A_i = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\,{}_A\langle \mathcal{F}_i \,|\, \mathcal{F}_i\rangle$ and $B_i = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\langle \mathcal{F}_i \,|\, \mathcal{F}_i\rangle_B$, and

$$\mathcal{F} = \overline{\sum_{i\in I} \mathcal{F}_i}.$$

If a (locally) regular Hilbert bimodule is concretely represented as a ternary ring of operators on some Hilbert space, then this ternary ring of operators is also (locally) regular. Conversely, if a (locally) regular ternary ring of operators is viewed as a Hilbert bimodule, this Hilbert bimodule is (locally) regular. Of course, every result on (local) regularity of ternary rings of operators can be translated into an equivalent result on (local) regularity of imprimitivity bimodules. For instance, a Hilbert sub-A, B-bimodule of a regular imprimitivity Hilbert A, B-bimodule $\mathcal{F}$ is again regular, and if A and B are commutative, then $\mathcal{F}$ is locally regular.

We end this section discussing some examples. Given a C^*-algebra B, we may consider the *trivial* B, B-imprimitivity bimodule $\mathcal{F} = B$ with the obvious structure. It is easy to see that it is regular. More generally, given C^*-algebras A and B and an isomorphism $\phi\colon A \to B$, we may give $\mathcal{F} = B$ the structure of an imprimitivity Hilbert A, B-bimodule with the canonical structure:

$$a \cdot \xi = \phi(a)b, \quad \text{(product in } B\text{)}\ , \quad {}_A\langle \xi \,|\, \eta\rangle = \phi^{-1}(\xi\eta^*) \quad \text{and}$$
$$\xi \cdot b = \xi b \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \xi \,|\, \eta\rangle_B = \xi^*\eta \text{ (product and involution of } B\text{)}$$

for all $a \in A$ and $\xi, \eta, b \in B$. We write ${}_\phi B$ for this A, B-bimodule. The associated multiplier $\mathcal{M}(A), \mathcal{M}(B)$-bimodule is just $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{M}(B)$, the multiplier algebra of B viewed as a $\mathcal{M}(A), \mathcal{M}(B)$-bimodule using the (unique) strictly continuous extension $\bar{\phi}\colon \mathcal{M}(A) \to \mathcal{M}(B)$ of ϕ. In other words, $\mathcal{M}({}_\phi B) =_{\bar{\phi}} \mathcal{M}(B)$. From this,

we see that ${}_\phi B$ is regular. In fact, it is enough to take a unitary multiplier of B (for instance, one may take the unit $1_B \in \mathcal{M}(B)$) and view it as a unitary multiplier of ${}_\phi B$. Moreover, up to isomorphism, every regular A, B-bimodule has the form ${}_\phi B$ for some isomorphism $\phi\colon A \to B$:

Proposition 2.11. *An imprimitivity A, B-bimodule $\mathcal{F}$ is regular if and only if there is an isomorphism $\phi\colon A \to B$ such that $\mathcal{F} \cong_\phi B$ as A, B-bimodules.*

Proof. Let u be a unitary multiplier of $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathcal{F} = A \cdot u = u \cdot B$. Then it easy to see that the map $\phi\colon A \to B$ defined by $\phi(a) = u^* a u$ is an isomorphism of C^*-algebras. Moreover, the map $b \mapsto ub$ from B to $\mathcal{F}$ induces an isomorphism ${}_\phi B \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{F}$ of A, B-bimodules. □

The above result says that the structure of a regular A, B-bimodule is, up to isomorphism, essentially trivial. Notice that the imprimitivity A, B-bimodule ${}_\phi B$ (induced from an isomorphism $\phi\colon A \to B$) is isomorphic to the trivial imprimitivity B, B-bimodule $B = {}_{\mathrm{id}}B$ (induced from the identity map $\mathrm{id}\colon B \to B$). More precisely, the identity map $\mathrm{id}\colon B \to B$ together with the coefficient homomorphisms $\phi\colon A \to B$ and $\mathrm{id}\colon B \to B$ defines an isomorphism ${}_\phi\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{id}}$ from the A, B-bimodule ${}_A B_B = {}_\phi B$ to the B, B-bimodule ${}_{\mathrm{id}}B = {}_B B_B$ (see [6, Definition 1.16] for the precise meaning of homomorphisms between bimodules with possibly different coefficient algebras).

From the above characterization of regular bimodules, we can also easily give examples of non-regular bimodules, simply taking any imprimitivity A, B-bimodule for which A and B are non-isomorphic C^*-algebras. For instance, one can take a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and view it as an imprimitivity $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}), \mathbb{C}$-bimodule. Then $\mathcal{H}$ is regular if and only if it is one-dimensional.

There is one special case where regularity is always present: this is the case where the coefficient algebras are *stable*. Recall that a C^*-algebra A is stable if $A \otimes \mathcal{K} \cong A$, where $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(l^2\mathbb{N})$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is an imprimitivity Hilbert A, B-bimodule with A and B separable (or, more generally, σ-unital) stable C^*-algebras, then $\mathcal{F}$ is regular (this follows from [1, Theorem 3.4]). Hence, after stabilization (tensoring with $\mathcal{K}$), we can make any separable (or, more generally, countably generated) imprimitivity Hilbert bimodule into a regular one.

Let us now consider the case where $A = B = \mathcal{C}_0(X)$ is a commutative C^*-algebra, where X is some locally compact Hausdorff space. It is well-known that imprimitivity $\mathcal{C}_0(X), \mathcal{C}_0(X)$-bimodules correspond bijectively to (Hermitian) complex line bundles over X (see [19, Appendix A]): given a complex line bundle L over X, it can be endowed with an Hermitian structure, that is, there is a continuous family of inner products $\langle \cdot \,|\, \cdot \rangle_x$ (which we assume to be linear on the second variable) on the fibers L_x. Then the space $\mathcal{C}_0(L)$ of continuous sections of L vanishing at infinity has a canonical structure of an imprimitivity $\mathcal{C}_0(X), \mathcal{C}_0(X)$-bimodule with the obvious actions of $\mathcal{C}_0(X)$ and the inner products:

$$ {}_{\mathcal{C}_0(X)}\langle \xi \,|\, \eta \rangle(x) = \langle \eta(x) \,|\, \xi(x) \rangle_x \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \xi \,|\, \eta \rangle_{\mathcal{C}_0(X)}(x) = \langle \xi(x) \,|\, \eta(x) \rangle_x . $$

When is $\mathcal{C}_0(L)$ regular? To answer this question, let us first observe that the associated multiplier $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{b}}(X), \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{b}}(X)$-bimodule is (isomorphic to) $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{b}}(L)$, the space of continuous bounded sections of L endowed with the canonical bimodule structure as above. Thus $\mathcal{C}_0(L)$ is regular if and only if there is a unitary element $u \in \mathcal{UC}_{\mathrm{b}}(L)$, that is, a continuous unitary section for L. In other words, we have proved the following:

Proposition 2.12. *The Hilbert $\mathcal{C}_0(X), \mathcal{C}_0(X)$-bimodule $\mathcal{C}_0(L)$ described above is regular if and only if the line bundle L is topologically trivial.*

The above result illustrates again the already mentioned triviality restriction imposed by regularity. From this point of view, the study of regular bimodules

seems to be trivial. However, the theory becomes interesting when one studies bundles of such bimodules. In this work we are interested in regular Fell bundles (over inverse semigroups), meaning Fell bundles for which all the fibers are regular bimodules. Although each fiber is then isolatedly isomorphic to a trivial bimodule, this isomorphism is not canonical, and the relation between these isomorphisms among different fibers is what makes the object interesting.

On the other hand, local regularity is much more flexible. For instance, the bimodule $\mathcal{C}_0(L)$ is always locally regular. In fact, notice that we already know this from Proposition 2.9, but essentially this is a manifestation of the fact that L is locally trivial. It is also easy to give examples of non-locally trivial bimodules. It is enough to take an imprimitivity Hilbert A, B-bimodule $\mathcal{F}$ for which A and B are non-isomorphic simple C^*-algebras. In this case $\mathcal{F}$ is *simple*, that is, there is no Hilbert sub-A, B-bimodule of $\mathcal{F}$, except for the trivial ones $\{0\}$ and $\mathcal{F}$. Hence $\mathcal{F}$ is locally regular if and only if it is regular, and in this case A and B are isomorphic by Proposition 2.11. As a simple example, consider any Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and view it as an imprimitivity $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{H}), \mathbb{C}$-bimodule. This is not locally trivial, unless $\mathcal{H}$ is one-dimensional.

3. Regular Fell bundles

First, let us recall the definition of Fell bundles over inverse semigroups (a concept first introduced by Nándor Sieben in [24] and later used by the second author in [9]).

Definition 3.1. Let S be an inverse semigroup. A *Fell bundle* over S is a collection $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ of Banach spaces $\mathcal{A}_s$ together with a *multiplication* $\cdot\colon \mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{A}\to\mathcal{A}$, an *involution* $^*\colon \mathcal{A}\to\mathcal{A}$, and isometric linear maps $j_{t,s}\colon \mathcal{A}_s\to\mathcal{A}_t$ whenever $s\leq t$, satisfying the following properties:

(i) $\mathcal{A}_s\cdot\mathcal{A}_t\subseteq\mathcal{A}_{st}$ and the multiplication is bilinear from $\mathcal{A}_s\times\mathcal{A}_t$ to $\mathcal{A}_{st}$ for all $s,t\in S$;
(ii) the multiplication is associative, that is, $a\cdot(b\cdot c)=(a\cdot b)\cdot c$ for all $a,b,c\in\mathcal{A}$;
(iii) $\|a\cdot b\|\leq\|a\|\|b\|$ for all $a,b\in\mathcal{A}$;
(iv) $\mathcal{A}_s^*\subseteq\mathcal{A}_{s^*}$ and the involution is conjugate linear from $\mathcal{A}_s$ to $\mathcal{A}_{s^*}$;
(v) $(a^*)^*=a$, $\|a^*\|=\|a\|$ and $(a\cdot b)^*=b^*\cdot a^*$;
(vi) $\|a^*a\|=\|a\|^2$ and a^*a is a positive element of the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}_{s^*s}$ for all $s\in S$ and $a\in\mathcal{A}_s$;
(vii) if $r\leq s\leq t$ in S, then $j_{t,r}=j_{t,s}\circ j_{s,r}$;
(viii) if $s\leq t$ and $u\leq v$ in S, then $j_{t,s}(a)\cdot j_{v,u}(b)=j_{tv,su}(a\cdot b)$ for all $a\in\mathcal{A}_s$ and $b\in\mathcal{A}_u$. In other words, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{A}_s\times\mathcal{A}_u & \xrightarrow{\mu_{s,u}} & \mathcal{A}_{su} \\
{\scriptstyle j_{t,s}\times j_{v,u}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle j_{tv,su}} \\
\mathcal{A}_t\times\mathcal{A}_v & \xrightarrow[\mu_{t,v}]{} & \mathcal{A}_{tv}
\end{array}$$

where $\mu_{s,u}$ and $\mu_{t,v}$ denote the multiplication maps.
(ix) if $s\leq t$ in S, then $j_{t,s}(a)^*=j_{t^*,s^*}(a^*)$ for all $a\in\mathcal{A}_s$, that is, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{A}_s & \xrightarrow{\ ^*\ } & \mathcal{A}_{s^*} \\
{\scriptstyle j_{t,s}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle j_{t^*,s^*}} \\
\mathcal{A}_t & \xrightarrow[\ ^*\ ]{} & \mathcal{A}_{t^*}
\end{array}$$

commutes.

If $\mathcal{A}_s \cdot \mathcal{A}_t$ spans a dense subspace of $\mathcal{A}_{st}$ for all $s, t \in S$, we say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *saturated*.

Later, we shall need the following technical result:

Lemma 3.2. *Let S be an inverse semigroup and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be a collection of Banach spaces satisfying all the conditions of Definition 3.1 except, possibly for axiom* (viii)*. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

(a) axiom (viii) *of Definition 3.1 holds (and hence $\mathcal{A}$ is a Fell bundle);*
(b) $j_{t,s}(a) \cdot b = j_{tu,su}(a \cdot b)$ whenever $s, t, u \in S$, $s \leq t$, $a \in \mathcal{A}_s$ and $b \in \mathcal{A}_u$ (that is, axiom (viii) *holds for $u = v$);*
(c) $a \cdot j_{v,u}(b) = j_{sv,su}(a \cdot b)$ whenever $s, u, v \in S$, $u \leq v$, $a \in \mathcal{A}_s$ and $b \in \mathcal{A}_u$ (that is, axiom (viii) *holds for $s = t$);*

Proof. Of course, (a) implies (b) and (c) (note that $j_{s,s}$ is the identity map for all $s \in S$). Applying the involution and using axioms (v) and (ix) of Definition 3.1, it follows that (b) and (c) are equivalent. Finally, suppose that (b) and (hence also) (c) hold. This means that the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}_s \times \mathcal{A}_u & \xrightarrow{\mu_{s,u}} & \mathcal{A}_{su} \\ {\scriptstyle j_{t,s}\times \mathrm{id}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle j_{tu,su}} \\ \mathcal{A}_t \times \mathcal{A}_u & \xrightarrow[\mu_{t,u}]{} & \mathcal{A}_{tu} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}_t \times \mathcal{A}_u & \xrightarrow{\mu_{t,u}} & \mathcal{A}_{tu} \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}\times j_{v,u}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle j_{tv,tu}} \\ \mathcal{A}_t \times \mathcal{A}_v & \xrightarrow[\mu_{t,v}]{} & \mathcal{A}_{tv} \end{array}$$

commute for all $s, t, u, v \in S$ with $s \leq t$ and $u \leq v$. Gluing these diagrams, we get the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}_s \times \mathcal{A}_u & \xrightarrow{\mu_{s,u}} & \mathcal{A}_{su} \\ {\scriptstyle j_{t,s}\times \mathrm{id}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle j_{tu,su}} \\ \mathcal{A}_t \times \mathcal{A}_u & \xrightarrow[\mu_{t,u}]{} & \mathcal{A}_{tu} \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}\times j_{v,u}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle j_{tv,tu}} \\ \mathcal{A}_t \times \mathcal{A}_v & \xrightarrow[\mu_{t,v}]{} & \mathcal{A}_{tv} \end{array}$$

Since $(\mathrm{id} \times j_{v,u}) \circ (j_{t,s} \times \mathrm{id}) = j_{t,s} \times j_{v,u}$ and $j_{tv,tu} \circ j_{tu,su} = j_{tv,su}$ (see axiom (vii) in Definition 3.1), this yields the desired commutativity of the diagram in Definition 3.1(viii). □

We shall say that a Fell bundle $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ is *concrete* if all the Banach spaces $\mathcal{A}_s$ are concretely represented as operators on some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ in such a way that all the algebraic operations of $\mathcal{A}$ are realized by the operations in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and, in addition, the inclusion maps $A_s \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_t$ for $s \leq t$ become real inclusions $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq \mathcal{A}_t$ in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. In other words, $\mathcal{A}$ is a concrete Fell bundle in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ if $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ for all $s \in S$ and the inclusion map $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ defines a *representation* of $\mathcal{A}$ (see Section 6 below and [9] for more details on representations of Fell bundles). Note that, in this case, each fiber $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is a ternary ring of operators.

Observe that every Fell bundle is isomorphic to some concrete Fell bundle. In fact, it is enough to take a faithful representation of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ on some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and consider the universal representation π^u of $\mathcal{A}$ into $C^*(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. By Corollary 8.9 in [9], the components $\pi^u_s \colon \mathcal{A}_s \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ of π^u are injective. It follows that the collection $\{\pi^u_s(\mathcal{A}_s)\}_{s\in S}$ is a concrete Fell bundle in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ which is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}$. Thus there is no loss of generality in assuming that a Fell bundle is concrete.

Definition 3.3. Let S be an inverse semigroup, and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be a (concrete) Fell bundle. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is *(locally) regular* if each fiber $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is (locally) regular as an imprimitivity Hilbert I_s, J_s-bimodule (or, equivalently, as a ternary ring of operators if $\mathcal{A}$ is concrete), where $I_s = \mathcal{A}_s\mathcal{A}_s^*$ and $J_s = \mathcal{A}_s^*\mathcal{A}_s$ (closed linear spans).

Remark 3.4. We shall work almost exclusively with saturated Fell bundles in this work. This is not a strong restriction since we are going to see later (see Proposition 8.6) that there is a way to replace $\mathcal{A}$ by another Fell bundle $\mathcal{B}$ (over a different inverse semigroup) such that $\mathcal{B}$ is saturated and $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ have isomorphic cross-sectional C^*-algebras. Note that for a saturated Fell bundle $\mathcal{A}$, we have $\mathcal{A}_s\mathcal{A}_s^* = \mathcal{A}_{ss^*}$ and $\mathcal{A}_s^*\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{A}_{s^*s}$.

Example 3.5. Consider the inverse semigroup $S = \{s, s^*, s^*s, ss^*, 0\}$ with five elements, where $s^2 = 0$ and 0 is a zero for S. A Fell bundle $\mathcal{A}$ over S is essentially the same as a Hilbert bimodule. In fact, if $\mathcal{F}$ is a Hilbert A, B-module, we define $\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{A}_{s^*} = \mathcal{F}^*$ (the Hilbert B, A-bimodule *dual* of $\mathcal{F}$; see [6, Example 1.6(3)] for the precise definition), $\mathcal{A}_{s^*s} = B$, $\mathcal{A}_{ss^*} = A$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{0\}$. Note that the only inequalities in the canonical order relation of S are $0 \leq t$ for all $t \in S$. Thus the inclusion maps are trivial: they do not play any important role. Conversely, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a Fell bundle over S, then $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}_s$ is a Hilbert A, B-bimodule in the natural way, where $A = \mathcal{A}_{ss^*}$ and $B = \mathcal{A}_{s^*s}$. All the aspects of the Fell bundle $\mathcal{A}$ can be described in terms of the Hilbert bimodule $\mathcal{F}$. For instance, $\mathcal{A}$ is saturated iff $\mathcal{F}$ is an imprimitivity Hilbert A, B-bimodule and $\mathcal{A}$ is (locally) regular iff $\mathcal{F}$ is.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be a regular, saturated, concrete Fell bundle in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Then each fiber $\mathcal{A}_s$ becomes a regular ternary ring of operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, so that, for each $s \in S$, we can choose a partial isometry $u_s \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ which is strictly associated to $\mathcal{A}_s$. Moreover, if $e \in E(S)$ is idempotent, then we may choose u_e to be the unit of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}_e)$ (the multiplier algebra of $\mathcal{A}_e \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$). We are going to denote the unit of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}_e)$ by 1_e to simplify the notation.

Let $A := C^*(\mathcal{A})$ be the (full) C^*-algebra of $\mathcal{A}$ and let B be the C^*-algebra $C^*(\mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{A}|_E$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{A}$ to the idempotent semilattice $E = E(S)$ of S. We may assume that $B \subseteq A \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ (we could have taken $\mathcal{H}$ to be the Hilbert space of a faithful representation of A to start with) and that $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq A$ for all $s \in S$. Note that $\mathcal{A}_e$ is an ideal of B for all $e \in E$.

With the assumptions above, we define the ideals $\mathcal{D}_s := \mathcal{A}_s\mathcal{A}_s^* = \mathcal{A}_{ss^*}$ in B, $s \in S$, and the maps

$$\beta_s \colon \mathcal{D}_{s^*} \to \mathcal{D}_s \quad \text{by } \beta_s(a) := u_s a u_s^* \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*}.$$

It is easy to see that β_s is well-defined and, since $u_s u_s^*$ is the unit of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{s^*})$, β_s is a *-isomorphism. Given $s, t \in S$, we also define $\omega(s,t) := u_s u_t u_{st}^* \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Note that $\omega(s,t) \in \mathcal{UM}(\mathcal{D}_{st})$ (the set of unitary multipliers). In fact, by [7, Proposition 6.5] $\omega(s,t)$ is a unitary multiplier of

$$\mathcal{A}_s\mathcal{A}_t\mathcal{A}_t^*\mathcal{A}_s^* = \mathcal{A}_{stt^*s^*} = \mathcal{D}_{st}.$$

Proposition 3.6. *With the notations above, the following properties hold for all $r, s, t \in S$ and $e, f \in E(S)$:*

(i) the linear span of $\cup_{e\in E}\mathcal{D}_e$ is dense in B;
(ii) $\beta_e \colon \mathcal{D}_e \to \mathcal{D}_e$ is the identity map;
(iii) $\beta_r(\mathcal{D}_{r^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_s) = \mathcal{D}_{rs}$;
(iv) $\beta_r \circ \beta_s = \mathrm{Ad}_{\omega(r,s)} \circ \beta_{rs}$;
(v) $\beta_r(x\omega(s,t))\omega(r,st) = \beta_r(x)\omega(r,s)\omega(rs,t)$ whenever $x \in \mathcal{D}_{r^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_{st}$;
(vi) $\omega(e,f) = 1_{ef}$ and $\omega(r, r^*r) = \omega(rr^*, r) = 1_{rr^*}$;

(vii) $\omega(s^*,e)\omega(s^*e,s)x = \omega(s^*,s)x$ *for all* $x \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*es}$;
(viii) $\omega(t^*,s) = \omega(t^*,ss^*)\omega(s^*,s)$ *whenever* $s \leq t$;
(ix) $\omega(t,r^*r) = \omega(t,s^*s)\omega(s,r^*r)$ *whenever* $r \leq s \leq t$.

Proof. Property (i) is clear because $\mathcal{D}_e = \mathcal{A}_e$ for all $e \in E$. Since $u_e = 1_e$ for all $e \in E$, (ii) is also clear. To prove (iii), note that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_r(\mathcal{D}_r^* \cap \mathcal{D}_s) = u_r\mathcal{D}_{r^*}\mathcal{D}_s u_r^* = u_r\mathcal{D}_{r^*}\mathcal{D}_s\mathcal{D}_{r^*}u_r^* \\ = u_r\mathcal{A}_{r^*r}\mathcal{A}_{ss^*}\mathcal{A}_{r^*r}u_r^* = \mathcal{A}_r\mathcal{A}_{ss^*}\mathcal{A}_r^* = \mathcal{A}_{rss^*r^*} = \mathcal{D}_{rs}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $1_e1_f = 1_{ef}$, so that

$$\omega(e,f) = u_eu_fu_{ef}^* = 1_e1_f1_{ef}^* = 1_{ef}.$$

This together with the following calculation proves (vi):

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(r,r^*r) = u_ru_{r^*r}u_{rr^*r}^* = u_r1_{r^*r}u_r^* = u_ru_r^* = 1_{rr^*} \\ = 1_{rr^*}1_{rr^*} = 1_{rr^*}u_ru_r^* = u_{rr^*}u_ru_{rr^*r}^* = \omega(rr^*,r).\end{aligned}$$

To prove (iv), first note that the domains of $\beta_r \circ \beta_s$ and β_{rs} coincide. In fact, by definition, $\mathrm{dom}(\beta_{rs}) = \mathcal{D}_{(rs)^*} = \mathcal{A}_{s^*r^*rs}$ and, on the other hand,

$$\mathrm{dom}(\beta_r \circ \beta_s) = \{x \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*} : \beta_s(x) \in \mathcal{D}_s \cap \mathcal{D}_{r^*}\} = \beta_s^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_s \cap \mathcal{D}_{r^*}).$$

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_s^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_s \cap \mathcal{D}_{r^*}) = \beta_s^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_s\mathcal{D}_{r^*}) = u_s^*\mathcal{A}_{ss^*}\mathcal{A}_{r^*r}u_s = \mathcal{A}_{s^*}\mathcal{A}_{r^*r}u_s \\ = \mathcal{A}_{s^*}\mathcal{A}_{ss^*}\mathcal{A}_{r^*r}u_s = \mathcal{A}_{s^*}\mathcal{A}_{r^*r}\mathcal{A}_{ss^*}u_s = \mathcal{A}_{s^*r^*r}\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{A}_{s^*r^*rs} = \mathcal{D}_{(rs)^*}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathrm{dom}(\beta_r \circ \beta_s) = \mathrm{dom}(\beta_{rs}) = \mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{Ad}_{\omega(r,s)} \circ \beta_{rs}) = \mathcal{D}_{(rs)^*}$. Moreover, since $\omega(r,s)u_{rs} = u_ru_s$, for all $x \in \mathcal{D}_{(rs)^*}$ we get

$$\beta_r(\beta_s(x)) = u_r(u_sxu_s^*)u_r^* = \omega(r,s)u_{rs}xu_{rs}^*\omega(r,s)^* = \omega(r,s)\beta_{rs}(x)\omega(r,s)^*.$$

Item (v) is equivalent to the equality

$$u_rxu_su_tu_{st}^*u_r^*u_ru_{st}u_{rst}^* = u_rxu_r^*u_ru_su_{rs}^*u_{rs}u_tu_{rst}^*. \tag{3.7}$$

The left hand side of this equation equals $u_rxu_su_tu_{st}^*1_{r^*r}u_{st}u_{rst}^*$. Since $re \leq r$, where $e = (st)(st)^*$, we have

$$u_rxu_su_tu_{st}^* \in u_r\mathcal{D}_{r^*}\mathcal{D}_{st}\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{st}) = \mathcal{A}_r\mathcal{D}_{st} = \mathcal{A}_{re} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_r.$$

Thus

$$u_rxu_su_tu_{st}^*1_{r^*r}u_{st}u_{rst}^* = u_rxu_su_tu_{st}^*u_{st}u_{rst}^* = u_rxu_su_t1_{(st)^*(st)}u_{rst}^*$$

Now note that

$$xu_su_t \in \mathcal{D}_{st}u_su_t = A_{st}\mathcal{A}_{t^*}\mathcal{A}_{s^*}u_su_t = \mathcal{A}_{st}\mathcal{A}_{t^*s^*s}u_t \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{st}\mathcal{A}_{t^*}u_t = \mathcal{A}_{st}\mathcal{A}_{t^*t} = \mathcal{A}_{st}.$$

Therefore, the left hand side of Equation (3.7) equals

$$u_rxu_su_t1_{(st)^*(st)}u_{rst}^* = u_rxu_su_tu_{rst}^*.$$

Similarly, the right hand side of Equation (3.7) equals

$$\begin{aligned}u_rxu_r^*u_ru_s1_{(rs)^*(rs)}u_tu_{rst}^* = u_rxu_r^*u_ru_su_tu_{rst}^* \\ = u_rx1_{r^*r}u_su_tu_{rst}^* = u_rxu_su_tu_{rst}^*.\end{aligned}$$

In order to prove (vii), take $s \in S$, $e \in E(S)$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*es}$. Note that

$$u_sx \in u_s\mathcal{D}_{s^*es} = u_s\mathcal{A}_{s^*es} = u_s\mathcal{A}_{s^*}\mathcal{A}_{es} = \mathcal{A}_{ss^*}\mathcal{A}_{es} = \mathcal{A}_{es} = \mathcal{A}_e\mathcal{A}_s$$

so that $1_e u_s x = u_s x$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(s^*,e)\omega(s^*e,s)x &= u_{s^*}u_e u^*_{s^*e}u_{s^*e}u_s u^*_{s^*es}x = u_{s^*}1_e 1_{ess^*}u_s 1_{s^*es}x\\ &= u_{s^*}1_e 1_{ss^*}u_s x = u_{s^*}1_e u_s x = u_{s^*}u_s x = u_{s^*}u_s 1_{s^*s}x = \omega(s^*,s)x.\end{aligned}$$

To prove (viii), suppose $s \le t$. Then $t^*s = s^*s$ and $t^*ss^* = s^*ss^* = s^*$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(t^*,ss^*)\omega(s^*,s) &= u_{t^*}u_{ss^*}u^*_{t^*ss^*}u_{s^*}u_s u^*_{s^*s} = u_{t^*}1_{ss^*}u^*_{s^*}u_{s^*}u_s 1_{s^*s} =\\ u_{t^*}1_{ss^*}1_{ss^*}u_s 1_{s^*s} &= u_{t^*}u_s = u_{t^*}u_s 1^*_{s^*s} = u_{t^*}u_s u^*_{s^*s} = u_{t^*}u_s u^*_{t^*s} = \omega(t^*,s).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, to prove (ix), assume that $r \le s \le t$. Note that $\omega(t,s^*s) = u_t u_{s^*s}u^*_{ts^*s} = u_t 1_{s^*s}u^*_s = u_t u^*_s$ and $1_{s^*s}u^*_r = 1_{s^*s}1_{r^*r}u^*_r = 1_{r^*r}u^*_r = u_r$. Therefore

$$\omega(t,s^*s)\omega(s,r^*r) = u_t u^*_s u_s u^*_r = u_t 1_{s^*s}u^*_r = u_t u^*_r = \omega(t,r^*r). \qquad \square$$

4. Twisted actions

In this section, we give a relatively simple definition of inverse semigroup twisted action generalizing Busby-Smith twisted actions [2] and closely related to twisted partial actions of [7] for (discrete) groups. It also generalizes the twisted actions in the sense of Sieben [23] for (unital) inverse semigroups. We then extend the main result in [7] proving that our twisted actions give rise to regular, saturated Fell bundles yielding in this way a structure classification of such bundles.

Definition 4.1. A *twisted action* of an inverse semigroup S on a C^*-algebra B is a triple $\big(\{\mathcal{D}_s\}_{s\in S}, \{\beta_s\}_{s\in S}, \{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}\big)$ consisting of a family of (closed, two-sided) ideals $\mathcal{D}_s$ of B whose linear span is dense in B, a family of *-isomorphisms $\beta_s\colon \mathcal{D}_{s^*} \to \mathcal{D}_s$, and a family $\{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}$ of unitary multipliers $\omega(s,t) \in \mathcal{UM}(\mathcal{D}_{st})$ satisfying properties (iv)-(vii) of Proposition 3.6, that is, for all $r,s,t \in S$ and $e,f \in E = E(S)$ we have:

(i) $\beta_r \circ \beta_s = \mathrm{Ad}_{\omega(r,s)} \circ \beta_{rs}$;
(ii) $\beta_r(x\omega(s,t))\omega(r,st) = \beta_r(x)\omega(r,s)\omega(rs,t)$ whenever $x \in \mathcal{D}_{r^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_{st}$;
(iii) $\omega(e,f) = 1_{ef}$ and $\omega(r,r^*r) = \omega(rr^*,r) = 1_r$, where 1_r is the unit of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_r)$;
(iv) $\omega(s^*,e)\omega(s^*e,s)x = \omega(s^*,s)x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*es}$.

We sometimes write (β,ω) to refer to a twisted action, implicitly assuming that β is a family of *-isomorphisms $\{\beta_s\}_{s\in S}$ between ideals $\mathcal{D}_{s^*} = \mathrm{dom}(\beta_s)$ and $\mathcal{D}_s = \mathrm{ran}(\beta_s)$, and ω is a family $\{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}$ of unitary multipliers $\omega(s,t) \in \mathcal{UM}(\mathcal{D}_{st})$.

Remark 4.2. If S has a unit 1, then the condition in the above definition that the closed linear span of the ideals $\mathcal{D}_e$ for $e \in E(S)$ is equal to B is equivalent to the requirement $\mathcal{D}_1 = B$ because $e \le 1$ so that $\mathcal{D}_e \subseteq \mathcal{D}_1$ for all $e \in E(S)$ (see Lemma 4.6(iv) below).

For a discrete group G, the only idempotent is the unit element $1 \in G$. In this case, axiom (iii) in the above definition is equivalent to the condition $\omega(1,s) = \omega(s,1) = 1_s$ for all $s \in G$. Moreover, it is easy to see that this implies axiom (iv). Hence, in the group case, our definition of twisted action is the same studied by Busby and Smith in [2] (see also [16]). It can also be seem as a special case of the twisted partial actions defined by the second named author in [7], where the condition $\beta_r(\mathcal{D}_{r^{-1}} \cap \mathcal{D}_s) = \mathcal{D}_r \cap \mathcal{D}_{rs}$ (axiom (b) in [7, Definition 2.1]) is replaced by $\beta_r(\mathcal{D}_{r^{-1}} \cap \mathcal{D}_s) = \mathcal{D}_{rs}$ (see Lemma 4.6(iii) below).

Remark 4.3. In [23], Nándor Sieben has considered a similar definition of twisted action (for unital inverse semigroups) in which the axiom

$$\omega(s,t) = 1_{st} \quad \text{whenever } s \text{ or } t \text{ is an idempotent} \tag{4.4}$$

is included, but we will see later (Section 5) that this is too strong in general, that is, it can not be derived from the axioms in Definition 4.1 and that our definition

really generalizes Sieben's one. In some sense, the axioms (iii) and (iv) appearing in Definition 4.1 are designed to replace (4.4) in a compatible way.

Let us say some words about axiom (iv) in Definition 4.1. First, note that it can be rewritten as

$$\omega(s^*, e)\omega(s^*e, s) = \mathcal{R}_{s^*es}(\omega(s^*, s)),$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{s^*es}\colon \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{s^*s}) \to \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{s^*es})$ is the restriction homomorphism. Observe that $\mathcal{D}_{s^*es}$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$ because $s^*es \leq s^*s$ (see Lemma 4.6(iv) below). It is not clear for us, whether axiom (iv) is a consequence of the others. The closest property we were able to prove is the following equality very similar to (iv):

$$\omega(e, s^*)\omega(es^*, s)x = \omega(s^*, s)x \quad \text{for all } e \in E(S),\ s \in S \text{ and } x \in \mathcal{D}_{es^*s}. \tag{4.5}$$

To prove this, we only need axioms (ii), (iii) and the fact that β_e is the identity on $\mathcal{D}_e$ (see Lemma 4.6(ii)). In fact, note that $\omega(e, s^*)\omega(es^*, s)x$ and $\omega(s^*, s)x$ belong to $\mathcal{D}_{es^*s} = \mathcal{D}_e\mathcal{D}_{s^*s} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_e$ (see Lemma 4.6 below). Moreover, if $y \in \mathcal{D}_{es^*s}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} y\omega(s^*, s)x = \beta_e\big(y\omega(s^*, s)\big)1_{es^*s}x &= \beta_e\big(y\omega(s^*, s)\big)\omega(e, s^*s)x \\ &= \beta_e(y)\omega(e, s^*))\omega(es^*, s)x = y\omega(e, s^*))\omega(es^*, s)x. \end{aligned}$$

Since y was arbitrary, this implies (4.5). As we have seen in Proposition 3.6, all the axioms in Definition 4.1 (and many others) are satisfied in case the cocycles $\omega(s, t)$ come from partial isometries u_s associated to a regular, saturated Fell bundle as in Section 3. Later, we are going to see (Proposition 5.1) that both axioms (iii) and (iv) are automatically satisfied in the presence of (i), (ii) and, in addition, Sieben's condition (4.4).

The following result gives some consequences of the axioms of twisted action (compare with Proposition 3.6).

Lemma 4.6. *If $\big(\{\mathcal{D}_s\}_{s\in S}, \{\beta_s\}_{s\in S}, \{\omega(s, t)\}_{s,t\in S}\big)$ is a twisted action of S on B, then the following properties hold for all $r, s, t \in S$ and $e, f \in E(S)$:*

(i) $\mathcal{D}_s = \mathcal{D}_{ss^*}$;
(ii) $\beta_e\colon \mathcal{D}_e \to \mathcal{D}_e$ *is the identity map;*
(iii) $\beta_r(\mathcal{D}_{r^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_s) = \mathcal{D}_{rs}$;
(iv) $\mathcal{D}_r \subseteq \mathcal{D}_s$ *if* $r \leq s$;
(v) $\mathcal{D}_r\mathcal{D}_s = \mathcal{D}_{rr^*s} = \mathcal{D}_{ss^*r}$ *and* $\mathcal{D}_{rs} = \mathcal{D}_{rss^*}$. *In particular,* $\mathcal{D}_e\mathcal{D}_f = \mathcal{D}_{ef}$;
(vi) $\beta_{s^*} = \mathrm{Ad}_{\omega(s^*,s)} \circ \beta_s^{-1}$;
(vii) $\beta_t|_{\mathcal{D}_s} = \mathrm{Ad}_{\omega(t,s^*s)} \circ \beta_s$ *whenever* $s \leq t$;
(viii) $\beta_s(\omega(s^*, s)) = \omega(s, s^*)$. *Here we have implicitly extended* $\beta_s\colon \mathcal{D}_{s^*} \to \mathcal{D}_s$ *to the multiplier algebras* $\beta_s\colon \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{s^*}) \to \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_s)$;
(ix) $\beta_r(x\omega(s, t)^*)\omega(r, s) = \beta_r(x)\omega(r, st)\omega(rs, t)^*$ *for all* $x \in \mathcal{D}_{r^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_{st}$;
(x) $\omega(s, e) = \omega(s, s^*se)$ *and* $\omega(e, s) = \omega(ess^*, s)$;
(xi) $\omega(r, e) = 1_{rr^*}$ *whenever* $e \geq r^*r$, *and* $\omega(f, s) = 1_{ss^*}$ *whenever* $f \geq ss^*$;
(xii) $\omega(t^*, s) = \omega(t^*, ss^*)\omega(s^*, s)$ *whenever* $s \leq t$;
(xiii) $\omega(t, r^*r)x = \omega(t, s^*s)\omega(s, r^*r)x$ *whenever* $r \leq s \leq t$ *and* $x \in \mathcal{D}_r$.

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{D}_s = \mathrm{dom}\,(\beta_s \circ \beta_{s^*}) = \mathrm{dom}\,(\mathrm{Ad}_{\omega(s,s^*)} \circ \beta_{ss^*}) = \mathcal{D}_{ss^*}$, which proves (i). To prove (ii), observe that $\beta_e \circ \beta_e = \mathrm{Ad}_{\omega(e,e)} \circ \beta_e = \beta_e$ because $\omega(e, e) = 1_e$. Since $\beta_e\colon \mathcal{D}_e \to \mathcal{D}_e$ is an automorphism, it must be the identity map. To check (iii), notice that

$$\beta_r(\mathcal{D}_{r^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_s) = \mathrm{ran}(\beta_r \circ \beta_s) = \mathrm{ran}(\mathrm{Ad}_{\omega(r,s)} \circ \beta_{rs}) = \mathcal{D}_{rs}.$$

To prove (iv), first observe that $sr^*r = r$ because $r \leq s$. Using (the just checked) property (iii), we get

$$\mathcal{D}_r = \mathcal{D}_{sr^*r} = \beta_s(\mathcal{D}_{s^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_{r^*r}) \subseteq \beta_s(\mathcal{D}_{s^*}) = \mathcal{D}_s.$$

To prove (v) we use that β_{rr^*} is the identity on $\mathcal{D}_{rr^*}$, and also (i) and (iii) to get

$$\mathcal{D}_r\mathcal{D}_s = \mathcal{D}_{rr^*}\mathcal{D}_s = \beta_{rr^*}(\mathcal{D}_{rr^*}\mathcal{D}_s) = \mathcal{D}_{rr^*s}.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}_r\mathcal{D}_s = \mathcal{D}_r \cap \mathcal{D}_s = \mathcal{D}_s\mathcal{D}_t$ (this holds for ideals of a C^*-algebra), we also have $\mathcal{D}_r\mathcal{D}_s = \mathcal{D}_{ss^*r}$. And by (i), we have $\mathcal{D}_{rss^*} = \mathcal{D}_{rss^*ss^*r^*} = \mathcal{D}_{rss^*r^*} = \mathcal{D}_{rs}$. To prove (viii), we use axioms (ii) and (iii) in Definition 4.1 to get

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_s(\omega(s^*,s)) = \beta_s(\omega(s^*,s))1_s &= \beta_s(\omega(s^*,s))\omega(s,s^*s)\\ &= \omega(s,s^*)\omega(ss^*,s) = \omega(s,s^*)1_s = \omega(s,s^*).\end{aligned}$$

Property (ix) is a consequence of (ii) in Definition 4.1. In fact, applying Definition 4.1(ii) with $x\omega(s,t)^*$ in place of x, we get

$$\beta_r(x)\omega(r,st) = \beta_r(x\omega(s,t)^*)\omega(r,s)\omega(rs,t).$$

Multiplying this last equation by $\omega(rs,t)^*$ on the right one arrives at (ix). In order to check (x), take $y \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*se}$ and define $x := \beta_s(y) \in \mathcal{D}_{ses^*}$ (note that every element of $\mathcal{D}_{ses^*}$ has this form for some $y \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*se}$). Note that $\omega(s,s^*se)$ and $\omega(s,e)$ are unitary multipliers of $\mathcal{D}_{se} = \mathcal{D}_{ses^*}$. Using axioms (ii) and (iii) in Definition 4.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&x\omega(s,s^*se) = \beta_s(y)\omega(s,s^*se) = \beta_s(y1_{s^*se})\omega(s,s^*se)\\ &= \beta_s(y\omega(s^*s,e))\omega(s,s^*se) = \beta_s(y)\omega(s,s^*s)\omega(ss^*s,e) = x1_{ss^*}\omega(s,e) = x\omega(s,e).\end{aligned}$$

Since x is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{D}_{ses^*}$, we must have $\omega(s,s^*se) = \omega(s,e)$. Similarly, we can check the second part of (x): note that $\omega(e,s)$ and $\omega(ess^*,s)$ are multipliers of $\mathcal{D}_{es} = \mathcal{D}_{ess^*}$. Take an arbitrary element $x \in \mathcal{D}_{ess^*} = \mathcal{D}_e \cap \mathcal{D}_{ss^*}$. Then, using again (ii) and (iii) in Definition 4.1 and that β_e is the identity map on $\mathcal{D}_e$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}x\omega(e,s) = \beta_e(x1_{ss^*})\omega(e,s) &= \beta_e(x\omega(ss^*,s))\omega(e,s)\\ &= \beta_e(x)\omega(e,ss^*)\omega(ess^*,s) = x1_{ess^*}\omega(ess^*,s) = x\omega(ess^*,s).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\omega(e,s) = \omega(ess^*,s)$. To prove (xi), take $r \in S$ and $e \in E(S)$ with $e \geq r^*r$. Then, by Definition 4.1(iii) and the property (x) just checked, we have $\omega(r,e) = \omega(r,r^*re) = \omega(r,r^*r) = 1_r = 1_{rr^*}$. The second part of (xi) is proved similarly. In order to prove (xii), assume that $s \leq t$ and take $x \in \mathcal{D}_s \subseteq \mathcal{D}_t$. Note that $y := \beta_{t^*}(x) \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*} = \mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$ and every element of $\mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$ has this form. Observe that $\omega(t^*,s)$, $\omega(t^*,ss^*)$ and $\omega(s^*,s)$ are unitary multipliers of $\mathcal{D}_{t^*s} = \mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$ and by axioms (ii) and (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}y\omega(t^*,s) = \beta_{t^*}(x1_{ss^*})\omega(t^*,s) &= \beta_{t^*}(x\omega(ss^*,s))\omega(t^*,s)\\ &= \beta_{t^*}(x)\omega(t^*,ss^*)\omega(s^*,s) = y\omega(t^*,ss^*)\omega(s^*,s).\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\omega(t^*,s) = \omega(t^*,ss^*)\omega(s^*,s)$. Finally, to prove (xiii), assume that $r \leq s \leq t$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_r = \mathcal{D}_{rr^*}$. Observe that $\omega(t,r^*r)x$ and $\omega(t,s^*s)\omega(s,r^*r)x$ are elements of $\mathcal{D}_r$ every element of $\mathcal{D}_r$ has the form $z = \beta_t(y)$ for some $y \in \mathcal{D}_{r^*} = \mathcal{D}_{r^*r}$. By axioms (ii) and (iii) in Definition 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}z\omega(t,r^*r)x = \beta_t(y1_{r^*r})\omega(t,r^*r)x &= \beta_t(y\omega(s^*s,r^*r))\omega(t,r^*r)x\\ &= \beta_t(y)\omega(t,s^*s)\omega(ts^*s,r^*r)x = z\omega(t,s^*s)\omega(s,r^*r)x.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\omega(t,r^*r)x = \omega(t,s^*s)\omega(s,r^*r)x$ as desired. □

Given a twisted action $\big(\{\mathcal{D}_s\}_{s\in S}, \{\beta_s\}_{s\in S}, \{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}\big)$, we would like to define a Fell bundle $\mathcal{B}$ over S as follows:

$$\mathcal{B} := \{(b,s) \in B \times S \colon b \in \mathcal{D}_s\} \tag{4.7}$$

Writing $b\delta_s$ for $(b,s) \in \mathcal{B}$, we define the operations:

$$(b_s\delta_s)\cdot(b_t\delta_t) := \beta_s\big(\beta_s^{-1}(b_s)b_t\big)\omega(s,t)\delta_{st} \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$(b_s\delta_s)^* := \beta_s^{-1}(b_s^*)\omega(s^*,s)^*\delta_{s^*} \tag{4.9}$$

for all $b_s \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and $b_t \in \mathcal{D}_t$. The product (4.8) is well-defined because $b_s \in \mathcal{D}_s = \mathrm{dom}(\beta_s^{-1})$ and hence $\beta_s^{-1}(b_s)b_t \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*}\mathcal{D}_t \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{s^*} = \mathrm{dom}(\beta_s)$. Moreover, axiom (i) of Definition 4.1 shows that

$$\beta_s\big(\beta_s^{-1}(b_s)b_t\big) \in \beta_s(\mathcal{D}_{s^*}\mathcal{D}_t) = \beta_s(\mathcal{D}_{s^*}\cap\mathcal{D}_t) = \mathcal{D}_{st}.$$

Since $\omega(s,t) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{st})$, we get $\beta_s\big(\beta_s^{-1}(b_s)b_t\big)\omega(s,t) \in \mathcal{D}_{st}$. It is easy to see that the involution (4.9) is also well-defined. Moreover, by Lemma 4.6(vi), $\beta_s^{-1}(a) = \omega(s^*,s)^*\beta_{s^*}(a)\omega(s^*,s)$, so that

$$(a\delta_s)^* = \beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\omega(s^*,s)^*\delta_{s^*} = \omega(s^*,s)^*\beta_{s^*}(a^*)\delta_{s^*}. \tag{4.10}$$

Observe that the formulas (4.8) and (4.9) are exactly the same ones appearing in [7, Section 2] for a Fell bundle defined from a twisted partial action of a group.

The main difficulty is to define the inclusion maps $j_{t,s}\colon \mathcal{B}_s \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_t$ whenever $s \le t$. One first obvious choice would be $j_{t,s}(b_s\delta_s) = b_s\delta_t$, but this does not work in general although it would work if we had Sieben's condition (4.4). The problem is to prove that the inclusion maps $j_{t,s}$ are compatible with the operations above. To motivate the correct definition, let us temporarily assume that the twisted action comes from partial isometries u_s associated to a regular, saturated, concrete Fell bundle $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ in $\mathcal{L}(H)$ as in Section 3. In this case, if $s \le t$ in S, then $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq \mathcal{A}_t \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H)$. And by regularity, $\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{D}_s u_s$ and $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{D}_t u_t$. So, any element $x \in \mathcal{A}_s$ can be written in two ways: $x = au_s = bu_t$ for some $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and $b \in \mathcal{D}_t$. The relation between a and b is $b = au_su_t^*$. Now note that $u_su_t^* = u_su_{s^*s}u_t^* = (u_tu_{s^*s}u_{ts^*s}^*)^* = \omega(t,s^*s)^*$, so that $b = a\omega(t,s^*s)^*$. Thus the inclusion $\mathcal{A}_s \subseteq \mathcal{A}_t$ determines a map $\mathcal{D}_s \to \mathcal{D}_t$ by the rule $a \mapsto a\omega(t,s^*s)^*$. Hence, it is natural to define

$$j_{t,s}\colon \mathcal{B}_s \to \mathcal{B}_t \quad \text{by} \quad j_{t,s}(a\delta_s) := a\omega(t,s^*s)^*\delta_t. \tag{4.11}$$

Note that $\omega(t,s^*s) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{ts^*s}) = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_s)$ and hence $a\omega(t,s^*s) \in \mathcal{D}_s \subseteq \mathcal{D}_t$ by Lemma 4.6(iv), so that $j_{t,s}$ is well-defined.

Theorem 4.12. *The bundle $\mathcal{B}$ defined by Equation* (4.7) *with the obvious projection $\mathcal{B} \twoheadrightarrow S$, with the linear and norm structure on each fiber $\mathcal{B}_s$ inherited from $\mathcal{D}_s$, with the algebraic operations* (4.8) *and* (4.9)*, and the inclusion maps* (4.11) *is a saturated, regular Fell bundle over S.*

Proof. Of course, the multiplication (4.8) is a bilinear map from $\mathcal{A}_s\times\mathcal{A}_t$ to $\mathcal{A}_{st}$ and the involution (4.9) is a conjugate-linear map from $\mathcal{A}_s$ to $\mathcal{A}_{s^*}$ for all $s,t \in S$. The associativity of the multiplication is proved in the same way as in [7, Proposition 2.4] (see also the proof of Proposition 3.1 in [23]; it is also possible to use the idea appearing in [5, Theorem 2.4] where no approximate unit is needed). Moreover, it is easy to see that $\|(a\delta_s)\cdot(b\delta_t)\| \le \|a\delta_s\|\|b\delta_t\|$ for all $s,t \in S$, $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and $b \in \mathcal{D}_t$. All this together gives us the axioms (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) in Definition 3.1.

Let us check that $\big((a\delta_s)^*\big)^* = a\delta_s$ for all $s \in S$ and $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$. By Equation (4.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big((a\delta_s)^*\big)^* &= \big(\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\omega(s^*,s)^*\delta_{s^*}\big)^* = \omega(s,s^*)^*\beta_s(\omega(s^*,s)\beta_s^{-1}(a))\delta_s\\ &= \omega(s,s^*)^*\beta_s(\omega(s^*,s))a\delta_s = \omega(s,s^*)^*\omega(s,s^*)a\delta_s = a\delta_s.\end{aligned}$$

Next, we prove that the involution on $\mathcal{B}$ is anti-multiplicative, that is, we show that $\big((a\delta_s)\cdot(b\delta_t)\big)^* = (b\delta_t)^*\cdot(a\delta_s)^*$ for all $a\in\mathcal{D}_s$ and $b\in\mathcal{D}_t$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\big((a\delta_s)\cdot(b\delta_t)\big)^* &= \big(\beta_s(\beta_t^{-1}(a)b)\omega(s,t)\delta_{st}\big)^*\\ &= \beta_{st}^{-1}\big(\omega(s,t)^*\beta_s(b^*\beta_s^{-1}(a^*))\big)\omega(t^*s^*,st)^*\delta_{t^*s^*} = \dots\end{aligned}$$

Let $x := b^*\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\in\mathcal{D}_t\cap\mathcal{D}_{s^*}$, so that $\beta_t^{-1}(x)\in\mathcal{D}_{t^*}\cap\mathcal{D}_{t^*s^*}$ and hence

$$\beta_s(x) = \beta_s(\beta_t(\beta_t^{-1}(s))) = \omega(s,t)\beta_{st}(\beta_t^{-1}(x))\omega(s,t)^*.$$

Thus, the above equals

$$\begin{aligned}\dots &= \beta_{st}^{-1}\big(\beta_{st}(\beta_t^{-1}(x))\omega(s,t)^*\big)\omega(t^*s^*,st)^*\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \omega(t^*s^*,st)^*\beta_{t^*s^*}\big(\beta_{st}(\beta_t^{-1}(x))\omega(s,t)^*\big)\delta_{t^*s^*} = \dots\end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 4.6(ix) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\dots &= \omega(t^*s^*,st)^*\beta_{t^*s^*}\big(\beta_{st}(\beta_t^{-1}(x))\big)\omega(t^*s^*,st)\omega(t^*s^*s,t)^*\omega(t^*s^*,s)^*\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \beta_{st}^{-1}\big(\beta_{st}(\beta_t^{-1}(x))\big)\omega(t^*s^*s,t)^*\omega(t^*s^*,s)^*\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \beta_t^{-1}(x)\omega(t^*s^*s,t)^*\omega(t^*s^*,s)^*\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \beta_t^{-1}(b^*\beta_s^{-1}(a^*))\omega(t^*s^*s,t)^*\omega(t^*s^*,s)^*\delta_{t^*s^*}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}(b\delta_t)^*\cdot(a\delta_s)^* &= \big(\beta_t^{-1}(b^*)\omega(t^*,t)^*\delta_{t^*}\big)\cdot\big(\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\omega(s^*,s)^*\delta_{s^*}\big)\\ &= \beta_{t^*}\Big(\beta_{t^*}^{-1}\big(\beta_t^{-1}(b^*)\omega(t^*,t)^*\big)\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\omega(s^*,s)^*\Big)\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \beta_{t^*}\Big(\beta_{t^*}^{-1}\big(\omega(t^*,t)^*\beta_{t^*}(b^*)\big)\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\omega(s^*,s)^*\Big)\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*} = \dots\end{aligned}$$

Let (u_i) be an approximate unit for $\mathcal{D}_t$ and define $y := \beta_{t^*}(b^*)\in\mathcal{D}_{t^*}$ and $z := \beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\omega(s^*,s)^*\in\mathcal{D}_{s^*}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\dots &= \beta_{t^*}\Big(\beta_{t^*}^{-1}\big(\omega(t^*,t)^*y\big)z\Big)\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \lim_i \beta_{t^*}\Big(\beta_{t^*}^{-1}\big(\omega(t^*,t)^*y\big)u_iz\Big)\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \lim_i \omega(t^*,t)^*y\beta_{t^*}(u_iz)\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \lim_i \omega(t^*,t)^*\beta_{t^*}(b^*u_iz)\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \omega(t^*,t)^*\beta_{t^*}(b^*z)\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \omega(t^*,t)^*\beta_{t^*}\big(b^*\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\omega(s^*,s)^*\big)\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*} = \dots\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 4.6(ix) again, the above equals

$$\begin{aligned}\dots &= \omega(t^*,t)^*\beta_{t^*}\big(b^*\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\big)\omega(t^*,s^*s)\omega(t^*s^*,s)^*\omega(t^*,s^*)^*\omega(t^*,s^*)\delta_{t^*s^*}\\ &= \beta_t^{-1}\big(b^*\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\big)\omega(t^*,t)^*\omega(t^*,s^*s)\omega(t^*s^*,s)^*\delta_{t^*s^*}.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\big((a\delta_s)\cdot(b\delta_t)\big)^* = (b\delta_t)^*\cdot(a\delta_s)^*$ if and only if

$$c\,\omega(t^*s^*s,t)^*\omega(t^*s^*,s)^* = c\,\omega(t^*,t)^*\omega(t^*,s^*s)\omega(t^*s^*,s)^*,$$

where $c := \beta_t^{-1}(b^*\beta_s^{-1}(a^*))\in\mathcal{D}_{t^*s^*}$. Multiplying the above equation on the right by $\omega(t^*s^*,s)\in\mathcal{UM}(\mathcal{D}_{t^*s^*})$ and taking adjoints, we see that it is equivalent to

$$\omega(t^*,s^*s)\omega(t^*s^*s,t)c^* = \omega(t^*,t)c^*.$$

And this last equation is a consequence of axiom (iv) in Definition 4.1. Therefore the involution on $\mathcal{B}$ is anti-multiplicative. It is easy to see that the involution is

isometric, that is, $\|(a\delta_s)^*\| = \|a\delta_s\|$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$. Thus, we have checked axiom (v) in Definition 3.1.

To prove axiom (vi) in Definition 3.1, take $s \in S$ and $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(a\delta_s)^* \cdot (a\delta_s) &= \big(\omega(s^*, s)^*\beta_{s^*}(a^*)\delta_{s^*}\big) \cdot (a\delta_s)\\ &= \beta_{s^*}\Big(\beta_{s^*}^{-1}\big(\omega(s^*, s)^*\beta_{s^*}(a^*)\big)a\Big)\omega(s^*, s)\delta_{s^*s}\\ &= \beta_{s^*}\big(\beta_{s^*}^{-1}(\omega(s^*, s)^*)a^*a\big)\omega(s^*, s)\delta_{s^*s}\\ &= \omega(s^*, s)^*\beta_{s^*}(a^*a)\omega(s^*, s)\delta_{s^*s}.\end{aligned}$$

Now note that $\omega(s^*, s)^*\beta_{s^*}(a^*a)\omega(s^*, s)$ is a positive element of $\mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$ and its norm equals $\|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2$.

In order to prove axiom (vii) in Definition 3.1, take $r, s, t \in S$ with $r \leq s \leq t$ and let $x \in \mathcal{D}_r$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}(j_{t,s} \circ j_{s,r})(a\delta_r) = j_{t,s}(j_{s,r}(a\delta_r)) &= j_{t,s}(a\omega(s, r^*r)^*\delta_s)\\ &= a\omega(s, r^*r)^*\omega(r, s^*s)^*\delta_t\\ &= (\omega(r, s^*s)\omega(s, r^*r)a^*)^*\delta_t = a\omega(t, r^*r)^*\delta_t,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equation we have used Lemma 4.6(xiii). Next, let us check that $j_{t,s}(a\delta_s)^* = j_{t^*,s^*}\big((a\delta_s)^*\big)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and $s \leq t$ in S. We have

$$\begin{aligned}j_{s,t}(a\delta_s)^* &= \big(a\omega(t, s^*s)^*\delta_t\big)^*\\ &= \omega(t^*, t)^*\beta_{t^*}(\omega(t, s^*s)a^*)\delta_{t^*} = \omega(t^*, s)^*\beta_{t^*}(a^*)\delta_{t^*},\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

where the last equation follows from the identity

$$\beta_{t^*}(a)\omega(t^*, s) = \beta_{t^*}(a\omega(t, s^*s)^*)\omega(t^*, t) \tag{4.14}$$

which in turn is a consequence of axiom (ii) in Definition 4.1. In fact, by Definition 4.1(ii), we have

$$\beta_{t^*}(a\omega(t, s^*s))\omega(t^*, s) = \beta_{t^*}(a)\omega(t^*, t)\omega(t^*t, s^*s) = \beta_{t^*}(a)\omega(t^*, t)1_{s^*s}.$$

By Lemma 4.6(vii), $\beta_{t^*}(a) \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$ so that $\beta_{t^*}(a)\omega(t^*, t)1_{s^*s} = \beta_{t^*}(a)\omega(t^*, t)$. Replacing a by $a\omega(t, s^*s)^*$, this yields (4.14) and hence also (4.13). On the other hand, using again Equation (4.10) and Lemma 4.6(vii),

$$\begin{aligned}j_{t^*,s^*}\big((a\delta_s)^*\big) &= j_{t^*,s^*}\big(\omega(s^*, s)^*\beta_{s^*}(a^*)\delta_{s^*}\big)\\ &= \omega(s^*, s)^*\beta_{s^*}(a^*)\omega(t^*, ss^*)^*\delta_{t^*}\\ &= \omega(s^*, s)^*\omega(t^*, ss^*)^*\beta_{t^*}(a^*)\omega(t^*, ss^*)\omega(t^*, ss^*)^*\delta_{t^*}\\ &= \omega(s^*, s)^*\omega(t^*, ss^*)^*\beta_{t^*}(a^*)\delta_{t^*}.\end{aligned}$$

Comparing this last equation with (4.13), we see that they are equal by Lemma 4.6(xii). This proves axiom (ix) in Definition 3.1.

To prove the missing axiom (viii) in Definition 3.1, we shall use Lemma 3.2 proving that $a\delta_s \cdot j_{v,u}(b\delta_u) = j_{sv,su}(a\delta_s \cdot b\delta_u)$ for all $s, v, u \in S$ with $u \leq v$, $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and $b \in \mathcal{D}_u$. Defining $c = \beta_s^{-1}(a)b \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_u$ and using Lemma 4.6(ix), we get

$$\begin{aligned}a\delta_s \cdot j_{v,u}(b\delta_u) &= (a\delta_s) \cdot (b\omega(v, u^*u)^*\delta_v)\\ &= \beta_s\big(\beta_s^{-1}(a)b\omega(v, u^*u)^*\big)\omega(s, v)\delta_{sv}\\ &= \beta_s\big(c\,\omega(v, u^*u)^*\big)\omega(s, v)\delta_{sv}\\ &= \beta_s(c)\omega(s, vu^*u)\omega(sv, u^*u)^*\delta_{sv}\\ &= \beta_s(c)\omega(s, u)\omega(sv, u^*u)^*\delta_{sv},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equation we have used that $u \leq v$ so that $vu^*u = u$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} j_{sv,su}(a\delta_s \cdot b\delta_u) &= j_{sv,su}\big(\beta_s(\beta_s^{-1}(a)b)\omega(s,u)\delta_{su}\big) \\ &= \beta_s(c)\omega(s,u)\omega(sv,u^*s^*su)^*\delta_{sv} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to see that $a\delta_s \cdot j_{v,u}(b\delta_u) = j_{sv,su}(a\delta_s \cdot b\delta_u)$, it is enough to check the equality $\omega(sv,u^*u) = \omega(sv,u^*s^*su)$. Since $u \leq v$, we have $v^*s^*svu^*u = v^*s^*su = v^*s^*suu^*u = v^*uu^*s^*su = u^*s^*su$. Using Lemma 4.6(x), we conclude that

$$\omega(sv,u^*u) = \omega(sv,v^*s^*svu^*u) = \omega(sv,u^*s^*su).$$

Therefore $\mathcal{B}$ is a Fell bundle over S. Note that $\mathcal{B}$ is saturated because the element $\beta_s(\beta_s^{-1}(a)b)\omega(s,t)$ appearing in the product

$$(a\delta_s)\cdot(b\delta_t) = \beta_s(\beta_s^{-1}(a)b)\omega(s,t)\delta_{st}$$

is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{D}_{st}$. In fact, $\beta_s^{-1}(a)b$ for $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and $b \in \mathcal{D}_t$ defines an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{D}_{s^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_t$, and by Lemma 4.6(iii), $\beta_s(\mathcal{D}_{s^*} \cap \mathcal{D}_t) = \mathcal{D}_{st}$. The conclusion follows because $\omega(s,t)$ is a unitary multiplier of $\mathcal{D}_{st}$. Finally, we leave the reader to check that $\mathcal{B}$ is regular with respect to the unitary multipliers $v_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_s)$ defined by

$$v_s \cdot (a\delta_{s^*s}) := \beta_s(a)\delta_s \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*s}. \tag{4.15}$$

Here $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_s) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_{s^*s},\mathcal{B}_s)$ denotes the multiplier of $\mathcal{B}_s$ considered as an imprimitivity Hilbert $\mathcal{B}_{ss^*},\mathcal{B}_{s^*s}$-bimodule. Observe that, formally, we have $v_s = \delta_s = 1_{ss^*}\delta_s$. Recall that 1_e denotes the unit of the multiplier algebra of $\mathcal{D}_e$. □

Summarizing our results, we have shown that there is a correspondence between twisted actions and regular, saturated Fell bundles. Given a twisted action (β,ω) of S on a C^*-algebra B, we have constructed above a regular, saturated Fell bundle $\mathcal{B}$. Moreover, the original twisted action (β,ω) can be recovered from the Fell bundle $\mathcal{B}$ using the unitary multipliers $v_s = 1_{ss^*}\delta_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_s)$ defined by Equation (4.15). More precisely, starting with $\mathcal{B}$ and the unitary multipliers v_s, and proceeding as in Section 3, we get a twisted action $(\tilde{\beta},\tilde{\omega})$ of S on the C^*-algebra $C^*(\mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{B}_e\}_{e\in E}$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{B}$ to $E = E(S)$. The C^*-algebra $\mathcal{B}_e = \mathcal{D}_e\delta_e$ is canonically isomorphic to the ideal $\mathcal{D}_e \subseteq B$ and the sum of these ideals is dense in B. By Proposition 4.3 in [9], this yields a canonical isomorphism $C^*(\mathcal{E}) \cong B$ extending the isomorphisms $\mathcal{B}_e \cong \mathcal{D}_e$. Under these isomorphisms, $\tilde{\beta}_s\colon \mathcal{B}_{s^*s} \to \mathcal{B}_{ss^*}$ corresponds to $\beta_s\colon \mathcal{D}_{s^*s} \to \mathcal{D}_{ss^*}$ and the unitary multipliers $\tilde{\omega}(s,t) \in \mathcal{UM}(\mathcal{B}_{stt^*s^*})$ correspond to $\omega(s,t) \in \mathcal{UM}(\mathcal{D}_{st}) = \mathcal{UM}(\mathcal{D}_{stt^*s^*})$. In fact, first note that (by Equation (4.9))

$$v_s^* = (1_{ss^*}\delta_s)^* = \omega(s^*,s)^*\delta_{s^*} = \omega(s^*,s)^*1_{s^*s}\delta_{s^*} = \omega(s^*,s)^*v_{s^*} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_{s^*}).$$

Thus, using Lemma 4.6(viii), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_s(a\delta_{s^*s}) &= v_s \cdot a\delta_{s^*s} \cdot v_s^* = (1_{ss^*}\delta_s)\cdot(a\delta_{s^*s})\cdot(\omega(s^*,s)^*\delta_{s^*}) \\ &= (\beta_s(a)\delta_s)\cdot(\omega(s^*,s)^*\delta_{s^*}) = \beta_s(a\omega(s^*,s)^*)\omega(s,s^*)\delta_{ss^*} \\ &= \beta_s(a)\omega(s,s^*)^*\omega(s,s^*)\delta_{ss^*} = \beta_s(a)\delta_{ss^*}. \end{aligned}$$

and (using that $\beta_s(1_{s^*s}1_e) = 1_{ses^*}$ for all $e \in E(S)$)

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\omega}(s,t) = v_s u_t u_{st}^* &= (1_{ss^*}\delta_s)\cdot(1_{tt^*}\delta_t)\cdot(1_{stt^*s^*}\delta_{st}) \\ &= \big(\beta_s(\beta_s^{-1}(1_{ss^*})1_{tt^*})\omega(s,t)\delta_{st}\big)\cdot\big(\omega(t^*s^*,st)^*\delta_{t^*s^*}\big) \\ &= \big(1_{stt^*s^*}\omega(s,t)\delta_{st}\big)\cdot\big(\omega(t^*s^*,st)^*\delta_{t^*s^*}\big) \\ &= \beta_{st}\big(\beta_{st}^{-1}(\omega(s,t))\omega(t^*s^*,st)^*\big)\omega(st,t^*s^*)\delta_{stt^*s^*} \\ &= \omega(s,t)\omega(st,t^*s^*)^*\omega(st,t^*s^*)\delta_{stt^*s^*} = \omega(s,t)\delta_{stt^*s^*}.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that the twisted action $(\tilde{\beta},\tilde{\omega})$ of S on $C^*(\mathcal{E})$ is isomorphic to the twisted action (β,ω) of S on B. Now let us assume that (β,ω) already comes from a regular, saturated Fell bundle $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ as in Section 3 for some family $u = \{u_s\}_{s\in S}$ of unitary multipliers $u_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}_s)$ with $u_e = 1_e$ for all $e \in E(S)$. In other words, we are assuming that $\beta_s(a) = u_s a u_s^*$ and $\omega(s,t) = u_s u_t u_{st}^*$. Then it is not difficult to see that the map $\mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ given on the fibers $\mathcal{B}_s \to \mathcal{A}_s$ by $a\delta_s \mapsto au_s$ is an isomorphism of Fell bundles $\mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{A}$. Moreover, under this isomorphism, the unitary multiplier $v_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_s)$ corresponds to $u_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}_s)$. All this together essentially proves the following result:

Corollary 4.16. *There is a bijective correspondence between isomorphism classes of twisted actions (β,ω) of S and isomorphism classes of pairs $(\mathcal{A},u)$ consisting of regular, saturated Fell bundles $\mathcal{A}$ over S and families $u = \{u_s\}_{s\in S}$ of unitary multipliers $u_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}_s)$ satisfying $u_e = 1_e$ for all $e \in E(S)$.*

An isomorphism of pairs $(\mathcal{B},v) \cong (\mathcal{A},u)$ has the obvious meaning: it is an isomorphism $\mathcal{B} \cong \mathcal{A}$ of the Fell bundles under which $v_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_s)$ corresponds to $u_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}_s)$ for all $s \in S$.

As already observed in Section 2, imprimitivity bimodules over σ-unital stable C^*-algebras are automatically regular. This immediately implies the following:

Corollary 4.17. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be a saturated Fell bundle for which all the fibers $\mathcal{A}_e$ with $e \in E(S)$ are σ-unital and stable. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to a Fell bundle associated to some twisted action of S.*

Remark 4.18. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $E(T)$. If $B = C^*(\mathcal{E})$ is stable, then so are the fibers $\mathcal{A}_e$ for all $e \in E(S)$ because each $\mathcal{A}_e$ may be viewed as an ideal of B. The converse is not clear and is related to Question 2.6 proposed in [22] of whether the sum of stable ideals in a C^*-algebra is again stable.

5. Relation to Sieben's twisted actions

In this section we are going to see that our notion of twisted action generalizes Sieben's definition appearing in [23].

Proposition 5.1. *Let S be an inverse semigroup, let B be a C^*-algebra, and consider the data $\big(\{\mathcal{D}_s\}_{s\in S},\{\beta_s\}_{s\in S},\{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}\big)$ satisfying* (i) *and* (ii) *as in Definition 4.1, and in addition assume that*

$$\omega(s,e) = 1_{se} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(e,s) = 1_{es} \quad \text{for all } s \in S \text{ and } e \in E(S). \tag{5.2}$$

Then $\big(\{\mathcal{D}_s\}_{s\in S},\{\beta_s\}_{s\in S},\{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}\big)$ is a twisted action of S on B.

Proof. If (5.2) holds, then axiom (iii) in Definition 4.1 is trivially satisfied. And axiom (iv) will follow from the following relation:

$$\omega(s^*,s)1_{s^*es} = \omega(s^*e,s) = \omega(s^*,es) \tag{5.3}$$

for all $s \in S$ and $e \in E(S)$. This is a consequence of properties (i) and (j) of Lemma 2.3 in [23]. Now, the first equation in (5.3) immediately implies (iv) in Definition 4.1 because $\omega(s^*, e) = 1_{s^*e} = 1_{s^*es}$. □

Definition 5.4. A twisted action (β, ω) satisfying *Sieben's condition* (5.2) is called a *Sieben's twisted action* (see [23, Definition 2.2]).

The following result gives conditions on a twisted action coming from a regular Fell bundle to be a Sieben's twisted action.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be a concrete, saturated, regular Fell bundle in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Given $s \in S$, let $u_s \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a partial isometry strictly associated to the ternary ring of operators $\mathcal{A}_s$ such that $u_e = 1_e$ for all $e \in E(S)$. Given $s, t \in S$, we write $\omega(s, t) := u_s u_t u_{st}^*$. Then the following assertions are equivalent*:

(i) $\omega(s, e) = 1_{se}$ *for all* $s \in S$ *and* $e \in E(S)$;
(ii) $u_s u_e = u_{se}$ *for all* $s \in S$ *and* $e \in E(S)$;
(iii) $u_r x = u_s x$ *for all* $r, s \in S$ *with* $r \leq s$ *and* $x \in \mathcal{A}_{r^*r}$;
(iv) $u_r \leq u_s$ *(as partial isometries of* $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$*) for all* $r, s \in S$ *with* $r \leq s$;
(v) $yu_r = yu_s$ *for all* $r, s \in S$ *with* $r \leq s$ *and* $y \in \mathcal{A}_{rr^*}$;
(vi) $u_e u_s = u_{es}$ *for all* $s \in S$ *and* $e \in E(S)$;
(vii) $\omega(e, s) = 1_{es}$ *for all* $s \in S$ *and* $e \in E(S)$;

Proof. Given $s, t \in S$, note that $u_s u_t$ is associated to $\mathcal{A}_{st}$ because

$$u_s u_t \mathcal{A}_{t^*s^*st} = u_s u_t \mathcal{A}_t^* \mathcal{A}_{s^*st} = u_s \mathcal{A}_{tt^*} \mathcal{A}_{s^*st} = u_s \mathcal{A}_{s^*st} = u_s \mathcal{A}_{s^*s} \mathcal{A}_t = A_s \mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{A}_{st}$$

and similarly $\mathcal{A}_{stt^*s^*} u_s u_t = \mathcal{A}_{st}$. Moreover $u_s u_t$ is strictly associated to $\mathcal{A}_{st}$ because $(u_s u_t)^*(u_s u_t) = u_t^* u_s^* u_s u_t = u_t^* u_{s^*s} u_t = 1_{t^*s^*st}$ (see Remark 5.6 and Proposition 2.5). Thus, we may view both $u_s u_t$ and u_{st} as unitary multipliers of the Hilbert bimodule $\mathcal{A}_{st}$. The equation $\omega(s, t) = 1_{st}$ is the same as $u_s u_t u_{st}^* = 1_{st}$ which is equivalent to $u_s u_t 1_{t^*s^*st} = u_{st}$ because $u_{st}^* u_{st} = 1_{t^*s^*st}$ and $1_{st} u_{st} = u_{st}$. Moreover, since $u_s u_t$ is a multiplier of $\mathcal{A}_{st}$, we have $u_s u_t 1_{t^*s^*st} = u_s u_t$. Therefore the equation $\omega(s, t) = 1_{st}$ is equivalent to $u_s u_t = u_{st}$. From this we see that (i) is equivalent to (ii) and (vi) is equivalent to (vii). Now, if $r \leq s$ in S, then $r = se$ for $e = r^*r$. Assuming (ii) and remembering that $u_e = 1_e$, we get

$$u_s x = u_s u_e x = u_{se} x = u_r x \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{A}_{r^*r}.$$

Thus (ii) implies (iii). Conversely, if $s \in S$ and $e \in E(S)$, and if we apply (iii) for $r = se$, then we get $u_{se} x = u_r x = u_s x = u_s u_e x$ for all $x \in A_{r^*r} = \mathcal{A}_{s^*se} = \mathcal{A}_{s^*s} \mathcal{A}_e$. This implies that $u_{se} = u_s u_e$ because both u_{se} and $u_s u_e$ are multipliers of $\mathcal{A}_{se}$. Hence (ii) is equivalent to (iii). In the same way one can prove that (v) is equivalent to (vi). Finally, condition (iv) is equivalent to $u_s u_{r^*r} = u_s u_r^* u_r = u_r$ whenever $r \leq s$ in S. Applying this for $r = se$ for some fixed $e \in E(S)$, and using that $u_{r^*r} = u_{s^*se} = u_{s^*s} u_e$ and $u_s u_{s^*s} = u_s$, we get condition (ii). Conversely, it is easy to see that (ii) implies (iv). Similarly, observing that (iv) is equivalent to $u_{rr^*} u_s = u_r u_r^* u_s = u_r$ for all $r \leq s$, one proves that (iv) is equivalent to (vi). □

Remark 5.6. Let notation be as in Proposition 5.5. Observe that the family of partial isometries $\{u_s\}_{s\in S}$ generates an inverse semigroup $\mathcal{I}$ under the product and involution of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Recall that the product uv of two partial isometries $u, v \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is again a partial isometry provided u^*u and vv^* commute. This happens for the partial isometries $\{u_s\}_{s\in S}$ because $u_s^* u_s = 1_{s^*s}$, $u_s u_s^* = u_{ss^*}$ and $1_e 1_f = 1_{ef} = 1_{fe} = 1_f 1_e$ for all $e, f \in E(S)$. Thus the product $u_s u_t$ is a partial isometry for all $s, t \in S$. Moreover, any finite product involving the partial isometries $\{u_s\}_{s\in S}$ and their adjoints $\{u_s^*\}_{s\in S}$ is again a partial isometry. The idea is that for any such product u, say, we have $u^*u = 1_e$ and $uu^* = 1_f$ for some $e, f \in E(S)$, and as we

already said, 1_e and 1_f commute. For example, to prove that $u_r u_s u_t$ is a partial isometry, one observes that $(u_r u_s)^*(u_r u_s)$ commutes with $u_t u_t^* = 1_{tt^*}$. In fact, note that

$$(u_r u_s)^*(u_r u_s) = u_s^* u_r^* u_r u_s = u_s^* 1_{r^*r} u_s$$

and for every $e \in E(S)$, we have $u_s^* 1_e u_s = 1_{s^*es}$ because, for all $x \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*es} = \mathcal{A}_{s^*es} = \mathcal{A}_{s^*}\mathcal{A}_{es}$ we have $u_s x \in u_s \mathcal{A}_{s^*}\mathcal{A}_{es} = \mathcal{A}_{ss^*}\mathcal{A}_{es} = \mathcal{A}_{es} = \mathcal{A}_e\mathcal{A}_s$, so that

$$u_s^* 1_e u_s x = u_s^* u_s x = 1_{s^*s} x = x,$$

where in last equation we have used that $\mathcal{D}_{s^*es} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$ because $s^*es \leq s^*s$. More generally, one can prove that

$$(u_{s_1} \dots u_{s_n})^*(u_{s_1} \dots u_{s_n}) = 1_{s_n^* \dots s_1^* s_1 \dots s_n}.$$

The inequality appearing in Proposition 5.5(iv) can be interpreted as the order relation of $\mathcal{I}$. This justifies the argument at the end of the proof of Proposition 5.5 where we have used that for $s \leq t$ in S, we have $u_s \leq u_t$ if and only if $u_s = u_t u_s^* u_s$ if and only if $u_s = u_s u_s^* u_t$.

Note that the cocycles $\omega(s,t)$ belong to the inverse semigroup $\mathcal{I}$. Moreover, if the partial isometries $\{u_s\}_{s\in S}$ satisfy the equivalent conditions (i)-(vii) of Proposition 5.5, then the cocycles $\{\omega(s,t)\}_{s,t\in S}$ satisfy

$$\omega(s,t) \leq \omega(s',t') \quad \text{for all } s,s',t,t' \in S \text{ with } s \leq s' \text{ and } t \leq t'. \tag{5.7}$$

Here we view the unitaries $\omega(s,t)$ and $\omega(s',t')$ as elements of $\mathcal{I}$ in order to give a meaning to the inequality (5.7). Note that this follows directly from condition (iv) in Proposition 5.5 because the product and the involution in $\mathcal{I}$ preserve the order relation. As in Proposition 5.5, condition (5.7) can be also rewritten as

$$\omega(s,t)x = \omega(s',t')x \quad \text{for all } s,s',t,t' \in S \text{ with } s \leq s' \text{ and } t \leq t' \text{ and } x \in \mathcal{D}_{st},$$

or equivalently as

$$x\omega(s,t) = x\omega(s',t') \quad \text{for all } s,s',t,t' \in S \text{ with } s \leq s' \text{ and } t \leq t' \text{ and } x \in \mathcal{D}_{st}.$$

6. Representations and crossed products

In this section we prove that the correspondence between regular Fell bundles and twisted actions obtained in the previous sections extends to the level of representations and yields an isomorphism of the associated universal C^*-algebras.

We start recalling the definition of representations of Fell bundles (see [9]):

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be a Fell bundles over an inverse semigroup S. A *representation* of $\mathcal{A}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a family $\pi = \{\pi_s\}_{s\in S}$ of linear maps $\pi_s \colon \mathcal{A}_s \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying

(i) $\pi_s(a)\pi_t(b) = \pi_{st}(ab)$ and $\pi_s(a)^* = \pi_{s^*}(a^*)$ for all $s,t \in S$, $a \in \mathcal{A}_s$, $b \in \mathcal{A}_t$;
(ii) $\pi_t(j_{t,s}(a)) = \pi_s(a)$ for all $s,t \in S$ with $s \leq t$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_s$. Recall that $j_{t,s} \colon \mathcal{A}_s \to \mathcal{A}_t$ denotes the inclusion maps as in Definition 3.1.

We usually view a representation of $\mathcal{A}$ as a map $\pi \colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ whose restriction to $\mathcal{A}_s$ gives the maps π_s satisfying the conditions above.

Next, we need a notion of covariant representation for twisted crossed products. It turns out that, although our definition of twisted action is more general than Sieben's one (see Section 5), the notion of representation still remains the same (see [23, Definition 3.2]):

Definition 6.2. Let (β,ω) be a twisted action of an inverse semigroup S on a C^*-algebra B. A *covariant representation* of (β,ω) on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a pair (ρ, v) consisting of a $*$-homomorphism $\rho \colon B \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and a family $v = \{v_s\}_{s\in S}$ of partial isometries $v_s \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying

(i) $\rho(\beta_s(b)) = v_s\rho(b)v_s^*$ for all $s \in S$ and $b \in B$;
(ii) $\rho(\omega(s,t)) = v_sv_tv_{st}^*$ for all $s,t \in S$; and
(iii) $v_s^*v_s = \rho(1_{s^*s})$ and $v_sv_s^* = \rho(1_{ss^*})$.

Recall that 1_e denotes the unit of the multiplier algebra of $\mathcal{D}_e = \mathrm{dom}(\beta_e)$ for all $e \in E(S)$. The third condition above is equivalent to the requirements $\rho(D_{s^*s})H = v_s^*v_sH$ and $\rho(\mathcal{D}_{ss^*})H = v_sv_s^*H$. In both axioms (ii) and (iii) above we have tacitly extended ρ to the enveloping von Neumann algebra B'' of B in order to give a meaning to $\rho(\omega(s,t))$ and $\rho(1_e)$.

To each notion of representation is attached a universal C^*-algebra which encodes all the representations. In the case of a Fell bundle $\mathcal{A}$, it is the so called *(full) cross-sectional C^*-algebra* $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ defined in [9]. For a twisted action (B,S,β,ω), the *(full) crossed product* $B \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S$ defined in [23] can still be used although our definition of twisted action is more general. Our aim in this section is to relate these notions when $\mathcal{A}$ is the Fell bundle associated to (B,S,β,ω) as in the previous sections.

Theorem 6.3. *Let (β,ω) be a twisted action of and inverse semigroup S on a C^*-algebra B, and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be the associated Fell bundle as in Section 4. Then there is a bijective correspondence between covariant representations of (β,ω) and representations of $\mathcal{A}$. Moreover, there exists an isomorphism $B \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S \cong C^*(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. Recall that the fiber $\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{D}_s\delta_s$ is a copy of $\mathcal{D}_s = \mathcal{D}_{ss^*} = \mathrm{ran}(\beta_s)$. During the proof we write u_s for the unitary multiplier $1_{ss^*}\delta_s \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}_s)$ (here $\mathcal{A}_s$ is viewed as an imprimitivity Hilbert A_{ss^*}, A_{s^*s}-bimodule). With this notation, we have $\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{D}_{ss^*}u_s$ for all $s \in S$. In particular, $\mathcal{A}_e = \mathcal{D}_e\delta_e \cong \mathcal{D}_e$ as C^*-algebras and this induces an isomorphism $C^*(\mathcal{E}) \cong B$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $E(S)$. Moreover, as we have seen in the previous section, the unitaries u_s can be used to recover the twisted action (β,ω) through the formulas:

$$\beta_s(b)\delta_{ss^*} = u_s(b\delta_{s^*s})u_s^*, \tag{6.4}$$

$$\omega(s,t)\delta_{stt^*s^*} = u_su_tu_{st}^*. \tag{6.5}$$

Let $\pi\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation of $\mathcal{A}$. This representation integrates to a *-homomorphism $\tilde{\pi}\colon C^*(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. We may view the fiber $\mathcal{A}_e$ for $e \in E(S)$ and $C^*(\mathcal{E})$ as subalgebras of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$. By restriction of $\tilde{\pi}$ to $C^*(\mathcal{E})$, we get a *-homomorphism ρ from $B \cong C^*(\mathcal{E})$ into $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ which is characterized by

$$\rho(b) = \tilde{\pi}(b\delta_e) \quad \text{whenever } e \in E(S) \text{ and } b \in \mathcal{D}_e.$$

By Proposition 2.7, the unitary multipliers u_s may be viewed as elements of the enveloping von Neumann algebra A'' of $A := C^*(\mathcal{A})$. Considering the unique weakly continuous extension of $\tilde{\pi}$ to A'' (and still using the same notation for it), we define the partial isometries $v_s := \tilde{\pi}(u_s) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. The pair (ρ,v) is a covariant representation of (β,ω). In fact, using Equation (6.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\beta_s(b)) &= \tilde{\pi}(\beta_s(b)\delta_{ss^*}) = \tilde{\pi}(u_s(b\delta_{s^*s})u_s^*)\\ &= \tilde{\pi}(u_s)\tilde{\pi}(b\delta_{s^*s})\tilde{\pi}(u_s)^* = v_s\rho(b)v_s^*\end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in S$ and $b \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$. Since the ideals $\mathcal{D}_e \subseteq B$ span a dense subspace of B, this proves (i) in Definition 6.2. Definition 6.2(ii) follows in the same way using Equation (6.5):

$$\rho(\omega(s,t)) = \tilde{\pi}(\omega(s,t)\delta_{stt^*s^*}) = \tilde{\pi}(u_su_tu_{st}^*) = \tilde{\pi}(u_s)\tilde{\pi}(u_t)\tilde{\pi}(u_{st})^* = v_sv_tv_{st}^*.$$

Since $u_s^*u_s = 1_{s^*s}\delta_{s^*s}$ and $u_su_s^* = 1_{ss^*}\delta_{ss^*}$, axiom (iii) in Definition 6.2 also follows easily. Hence we have a map $\pi \mapsto (\rho,v)$ from the set of representations of $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ to the set of covariant representation of (β,ω) on $\mathcal{H}$.

Conversely, let us now start with a covariant representation (ρ, v) of (β, ω) on $\mathcal{H}$. Then we can define $\pi\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ by $\pi(a\delta_s) := \rho(a)v_s$ for all $s \in S$ and $a \in \mathcal{D}_{ss^*}$. Before we prove that π is a representation of $\mathcal{A}$, observe that $v_e = \pi(1_e)$ for all $e \in E(S)$ (see proof of Proposition 3.5 in [23]) so that $v_s^* v_s = \rho(1_{s^*s}) = v_{s^*s}$ and $v_s v_s^* = \rho(1_{ss^*}) = v_{ss^*}$ for all $s \in S$. By Lemma 4.6(vi), we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_s\rho(\beta_s^{-1}(a)) &= v_s\rho(\omega(s^*, s))^*\rho(\beta_{s^*}(a))\rho(\omega(s^*, s)) \\ &= v_s v_{s^*s} v_s^* v_{s^*}^* v_{s^*}\rho(a)v_{s^*}^* v_{s^*} v_s v_{s^*s} = \rho(a)v_s = \pi(a\delta_s). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $s, t \in S$, $a \in \mathcal{D}_{ss^*}$ and $b \in \mathcal{D}_{tt^*}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi\big((a\delta_s)\cdot(b\delta_t)\big) &= \pi\big(\beta_s(\beta_s^{-1}(a)b)\omega(s, t)\delta_{st}\big) \\ &= \rho\big(\beta_s(\beta_s^{-1}(a)b)\big)\rho(\omega(s, t))v_{st} \\ &= v_s\rho(\beta_s^{-1}(a))\rho(b)v_s^* v_s v_t v_{st}^* v_{st} \\ &= v_s\rho(\beta_s^{-1}(a))\rho(b)v_t = \pi(a\delta_s)\pi(b\delta_t). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi\big((a\delta_s)^*\big) &= \pi(\beta_s^{-1}(a^*)\omega(s^*, s)^*\delta_{s^*}) = \rho(\beta_s^{-1}(a^*))\rho(\omega(s^*, s)^*)v_{s^*} \\ &= \rho(\beta_s^{-1}(a^*))(v_{s^*}v_s v_{s^*s})^* v_{s^*} = \rho(\beta_s^{-1}(a^*))v_s^* \\ &= v_s^*\rho(a^*)v_s v_s^* = (\rho(a)v_s)^* = \pi(a\delta_s)^*. \end{aligned}$$

This proves axiom (i) in Definition 6.1. To prove Definition 6.1(ii), take $s, t \in S$ with $s \le t$ and $a \in \mathcal{D}_{s^*s}$. Note that

$$v_{s^*s}v_t^* v_t = \rho(1_{s^*s})\rho(1_{t^*t}) = \rho(1_{s^*st^*t}) = \rho(1_{s^*s}) = v_{s^*s}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(j_{t,s}(a)) = \pi(a\omega(t, s^*s)^*\delta_t) &= \rho(a\omega(t, s^*s)^*)v_t = \rho(a)(v_t v_{s^*s}v_{ts^*s}^*)^* v_t \\ &= \rho(a)v_s v_{s^*s}v_t^* v_t = \rho(a)v_s v_{s^*s} = \rho(a)v_s = \pi(a). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore π is a representation of $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{H}$. It is not difficult to see that the assignments $\pi \mapsto (\rho, v)$ and $(\rho, v) \mapsto \pi$ between representations π of $\mathcal{A}$ and covariant representations (ρ, v) of (β, ω) are inverse to each other and hence give the desired bijective correspondence as in the assertion. The isomorphism $B \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S \cong C^*(\mathcal{A})$ now follows from the universal properties of $B \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S$ and $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ with respect to (covariant) representations (see [9, 23] for details). □

In [9] the second named author also defines the *reduced cross-sectional algebra* $C_{\rm r}^*(\mathcal{A})$ of a Fell bundle $\mathcal{A}$. It is the image of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ by (the integrated form of) a certain special representation of $\mathcal{A}$, the so called *regular representation* of $\mathcal{A}$. Using Theorem 6.3 we can now also define reduced crossed products for twisted actions (this was not defined in [23]):

Definition 6.6. Let (B, S, β, ω) be a twisted action and let $\mathcal{A}$ be the associated Fell bundle. Let Λ denote the regular representation of $\mathcal{A}$ as defined in [9, Section 8]. The *regular covariant representation* of (B, S, β, ω) is the representation (λ, υ) corresponding to Λ as in Theorem 6.3. The *reduced crossed product* is

$$B \rtimes_{\beta,\omega}^{\rm r} S := \lambda \rtimes \upsilon\big(B \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S\big),$$

where $\lambda \rtimes \upsilon$ is the *integrated form* of (λ, υ) defined in [23, Definition 3.6].

Notice that, by definition, we have a canonical isomorphism

$$B \rtimes_{\beta,\omega}^{\rm r} S \cong C_{\rm r}^*(\mathcal{A}). \tag{6.7}$$

7. Relation to twisted groupoids

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a locally compact étale groupoid with unit space $X = \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ (see [8, 11, 17, 20] for further details on étale groupoids). Recall that a *twist* over $\mathcal{G}$ is a topological groupoid Σ that fits into a groupoid extension of the form

$$\mathbb{T} \times X \hookrightarrow \Sigma \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{G}. \tag{7.1}$$

The pair $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ is then called a *twisted étale groupoid*. We refer the reader to [4, 15, 21] for more details. Twists over $\mathcal{G}$ can be alternatively described as principal circle bundles (these are the $\mathbb{T}$-groupoids defined in [15, Section 2]) and the classical passage to (complex) line bundles enables us to view twists over $\mathcal{G}$ as *Fell line bundles* over $\mathcal{G}$, that is, (locally trivial) one-dimensional Fell bundles over the groupoid $\mathcal{G}$ in the sense of Kumjian [13].

As we have seen in [3], there is a correspondence between twisted étale groupoids and *semi-abelian* saturated Fell bundles over inverse semigroups, that is, saturated Fell bundles $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ for which $\mathcal{A}_e$ is an abelian C^*-algebra for all $e \in E(S)$. This enables us to apply our previous results and describe twisted étale groupoids from the point of view of twisted actions of inverse semigroups on abelian C^*-algebras (compare with [17, Theorem 3.3.1], [18, Theorem 8.1] and [8, Theorem 9.9]):

Theorem 7.2. *Given a twisted étale groupoid $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$, there is an inverse semigroup S consisting of bisections of $\mathcal{G}$ and a twisted action (β, ω) of S on $\mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big)$ such that the (reduced) groupoid C^*-algebra $C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ is isomorphic to the (reduced) crossed product $\mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big) \rtimes^{\mathrm{r}}_{\beta,\omega} S$. Conversely, if (β, ω) is a twisted action of an inverse semigroup S on a commutative C^*-algebra $\mathcal{C}_0(X)$ for some locally compact Hausdorff space X, then there is a twisted étale groupoid $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ with $\mathcal{G}^{(0)} = X$ such that $C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma) \cong \mathcal{C}_0(X) \rtimes^{\mathrm{r}}_{\beta,\omega} S$.*

If, in addition, the groupoid $\mathcal{G}$ is Hausdorff or second countable, then we also have an isomorphism of full C^*-algebras $C^*(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma) \cong \mathcal{C}_0(X) \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S$.

Proof. Let $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ be a twisted étale groupoid and let L be the associated Fell line bundle over $\mathcal{G}$. Recall that an open subset $s \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ is a *bisection* (also called *slice* in [8]) if the restrictions of the source and range maps $\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{r}\colon \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ to s are homeomorphisms onto their images. The set $S(\mathcal{G})$ of all bisections of $\mathcal{G}$ forms an inverse semigroup with respect to the product $st := \{\alpha\beta\colon \alpha \in s, \beta \in t, \mathrm{d}(\alpha) = \mathrm{r}(\beta)\}$ and the involution $s^* := \{\alpha^{-1}\colon \alpha \in s\}$ (see [8]). Given $s \in S(\mathcal{G})$, let L_s be the restriction of L to s. Let S be the subset of $S(\mathcal{G})$ consisting of all bisections $s \in S(\mathcal{G})$ for which the line bundle L_s is trivial. If L_s and L_t are trivial, then so are L_{st} and L_{s^*} because the (convolution) product $\xi\cdot\eta$ (defined by $(\xi\cdot\eta)(\gamma) := \xi(\alpha)\eta(\beta)$ whenever $\gamma = \alpha\beta \in st$) is a unitary section of L_{st} provided ξ and η are unitary sections of L_s and L_t, respectively (note that in a Fell line bundle L, we have $\|ab\| = \|a\|\|b\|$ for all $a, b \in L$); and the involution $\xi^*(\gamma) := \xi(\gamma^{-1})^*$ also provides a bijective correspondence between unitary sections of L_s and L_{s^*}. Thus S is an inverse sub-semigroup of $S(\mathcal{G})$. Since L is locally trivial, S is a covering for $\mathcal{G}$ and we obviously have $s \cap t \in S$ for $s, t \in S$. In particular, S is *wide* in the sense of [3, Definition 2.14], that is, it satisfies the condition:

$$\text{for all } s, t \in S \text{ and } \gamma \in s \cap t, \text{ there is } r \in S \text{ such that } \gamma \in r \subseteq s \cap t. \tag{7.3}$$

This condition also appears in [8, Proposition 5.4.ii]. For each $s \in S$, we define $\mathcal{A}_s$ to be the space $\mathcal{C}_0(L_s)$ of continuous sections of L_s vanishing at infinity. Then, with respect to the (convolution) product and the involution of sections defined above, the family $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ is a saturated Fell bundle over S (see [3, Example 2.11] for details). Moreover, by Proposition 2.12, the Hilbert $\mathcal{C}_0(ss^*), \mathcal{C}_0(s^*s)$-bimodule $\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{C}_0(L_s)$ is regular because L is trivial over every $s \in S$. Thus $\mathcal{A}$ is a saturated,

regular Fell bundle. By our construction in Section 3, $\mathcal{A}$ gives rise to a twisted action (β, ω) of S on $B = C^*(\mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $E(S)$. Observe that $E(S)$ is a covering for $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and since L is trivial over $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ (because it is a one-dimensional continuous C^*-bundle) we have $\mathcal{C}_0(L_e) \cong \mathcal{C}_0(e)$ for every $e \in E(S)$ (note that $e \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{(0)}$). This implies that $B \cong \mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big)$ by an application of Proposition 4.3 in [9]. By Theorem 6.3 and Equation (6.7), we have canonical isomorphisms $\mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big) \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S \cong C^*(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big) \rtimes^{\mathrm{r}}_{\beta,\omega} S \cong C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{A})$. Moreover, by [3, Theorem 4.11], $C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{A}) \cong C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ and by [3, Proposition 2.18], $\mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big) \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S \cong C^*(\mathcal{A})$ provided $\mathcal{G}$ is Hausdorff or second countable.

Conversely, starting with a twisted action (β, ω) of an inverse semigroup S on a commutative C^*-algebra $\mathcal{C}_0(X)$, let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be the associated Fell bundle as in Section 4. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is saturated and semi-abelian, so the construction in [3, Section 3] provides a twisted étale groupoid $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ with $\mathcal{G}^{(0)} = X$ together with isomorphisms $C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma) \cong C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big) \rtimes^{\mathrm{r}}_{\beta,\omega} S$ again by [3, Theorem 4.11] and Equation 6.7; and if $\mathcal{G}$ is Hausdorff or second countable then $C^*(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma) \cong C^*(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big) \rtimes_{\beta,\omega} S$ by [3, Proposition 3.40], [3, Proposition 2.18] and Theorem 6.3. □

We shall next study the question of whether or not the twisted action constructed from a twisted groupoid as above satisfies Sieben's condition (see Definition 5.4).

Proposition 7.4. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ be a twisted groupoid and let $(\mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big), S, \beta, \omega)$ be a twisted action associated to $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ as in Theorem 7.2. Then the cocycles $\omega(s,t)$ can be chosen to satisfy Sieben's condition* (4.4) *if and only if the twist Σ is topologically trivial* (*that is, $\Sigma \cong \mathbb{T} \times \mathcal{G}$ as circle bundles*) *or, equivalently, if the Fell line bundle L associated to $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$ is topologically trivial* (*that is, $L \cong \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{G}$ as complex line bundles*).

Proof. We shall use the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 7.2. By definition, (β, ω) is the twisted action associated to the regular Fell bundles $\mathcal{A}$ as in Section 3. Thus, the cocycles $\omega(s,t)$ are given by $u_s u_t u_{st}^*$ for a certain choice of unitary multipliers u_s of $\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{C}_0(L_s)$. Since $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_0(L_s)) \cong \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{b}}(L_s)$, u_s may be viewed as a unitary section of L_s. Suppose the cocycles $\omega(s,t)$ satisfy (4.4). We are going to prove that L is topologically trivial, that is, that there is a global continuous unitary section of L. By Proposition 5.5, the family $\{u_s\}_{s\in S}$ of unitary sections satisfy $u_s \leq u_t$ whenever $s, t \in S$ with $s \leq t$. This means that u_s is the restriction of u_t whenever $s \subseteq t$ (this is the order relation of $S \subseteq S(\mathcal{G})$). Now if s, t are arbitrary elements of S, the sections u_s and u_t have to coincide on the intersection $s \cap t$. If fact, since S satisfies (7.3), given $\gamma \in s \cap t$, there is $r \in S$ such that $\gamma \in r \subseteq s \cap t$. Hence $r \subseteq s$ and $r \subseteq t$, so that $u_s(\gamma) = u_r(\gamma) = u_t(\gamma)$. Thus the map $u\colon \mathcal{G} \to L$ defined by

$$u(\gamma) := u_s(\gamma) \quad \text{whenever } s \text{ is an element of } S \text{ containing } \gamma \in \mathcal{G}$$

is a well-defined continuous unitary section of L and therefore L is topologically trivial. Conversely, if L is topologically trivial and $u\colon \mathcal{G} \to L$ is a continuous unitary section, then we may take u_s to be the restriction of u to the bisection $s \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. In this way u_s is the restriction of u_t whenever $s \subseteq t$. Again by Proposition 5.5, the cocycles $\omega(s,t) = u_s u_t u_{st}^*$ satisfy Sieben's condition (4.4). □

It is well-known (see [15, Section 2]) that the topologically trivial twists are exactly those associated to a 2-cocycle $\tau\colon \mathcal{G}^{(2)} \to \mathbb{T}$ in the sense of Renault [20]. Moreover, by Example 2.1 in [15] there are twisted groupoids that are not topologically trivial. This example shows that Sieben's condition (5.2) cannot be expected to hold in general and therefore our notion of twisted action (Definition 4.1) properly generalizes Sieben's [23, Definition 2.2].

In what follows we briefly describe the twists associated to 2-cocycles and relate them to our cocycles $\omega(s,t)$. Let $\tau\colon \mathcal{G}^{(2)} \to \mathbb{T}$ be a 2-cocycle. Recall that τ satisfies the cocycle condition

$$\tau(\alpha,\beta)\tau(\alpha\beta,\gamma) = \tau(\beta,\gamma)\tau(\alpha,\beta\gamma) \quad \text{for all } (\alpha,\beta),(\beta,\gamma) \in \mathcal{G}^{(2)}.$$

It is interesting to observe the similarity of this condition with our cocycle condition appearing in Definition 4.1(ii). In addition, we also assume that the 2-cocycle τ is *normalized* in the sense that (compare with Definition 4.1(iii))

$$\tau(\alpha, \mathrm{d}(\alpha)) = \tau(\mathrm{r}(\alpha),\alpha) = 1 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Given a 2-cocycle τ on $\mathcal{G}$ as above, the associated twisted groupoid $(\mathcal{G},\Sigma)$ is defined as follows. Topologically, Σ is the trivial circle bundle $\mathbb{T}\times\mathcal{G}$. And the operations are defined by

$$(\lambda,\alpha)\cdot(\mu,\beta) = (\lambda\mu\tau(\alpha,\beta),\alpha\beta) \quad \text{for all } \lambda,\mu\in\mathbb{T} \text{ and } (\alpha,\beta)\in\mathcal{G}^{(2)} \tag{7.5}$$

$$(\lambda,\alpha)^{-1} = (\overline{\lambda\tau(\alpha^{-1},\alpha)},\alpha^{-1}) \quad \text{for all } \lambda\in\mathbb{T} \text{ and } \alpha\in\mathcal{G}. \tag{7.6}$$

In this way, Σ is a topological groupoid and the trivial maps $\mathbb{T}\times\mathcal{G}^{(0)} \hookrightarrow \Sigma$ and $\Sigma \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ give us a groupoid extension as in (7.1). The twisted groupoid $(\mathcal{G},\Sigma)$ corresponds to the (topologically trivial) Fell line bundle $L = \mathbb{C}\times\mathcal{G}$ with algebraic operations of multiplication and involution given by the same formulas as in equations (7.5) and (7.6) (only replacing $\mathbb{T}$ by $\mathbb{C}$ and the inversion $^{-1}$ on the left hand side of (7.6) by the involution * sign).

Proposition 7.7. *Let $(\mathcal{G},\Sigma)$ be the twisted groupoid associated to a 2-cocycle τ on $\mathcal{G}$ as above, and let $(\mathcal{C}_0\big(\mathcal{G}^{(0)}\big),S,\beta,\omega)$ be the twisted action associated to $(\mathcal{G},\Sigma)$ as in Theorem 7.2 through the unitary sections u_s of $L_s = \mathbb{C}\times s$ given by $u_s(\gamma) = (1,\gamma)$ for all $\gamma\in s$. Then*

$$\beta_s(a)(\mathrm{r}(\gamma)) = a(\mathrm{d}(\gamma)) \quad \textit{and} \quad \omega(s,t)(\mathrm{r}(\alpha\beta)) = \tau(\alpha,\beta) \tag{7.8}$$

for all $s,t\in S$, $a\in\mathcal{C}_0(s^*s)$, $\alpha,\gamma\in s$ and $\beta\in t$ with $\mathrm{d}(\alpha)=\mathrm{r}(\beta)$.

Proof. Note that $\mathrm{dom}(\beta_s) = \mathcal{D}_{s^*s} = \mathcal{C}_0(s^*s)$ and $\mathrm{ran}(\beta_s) = \mathcal{D}_{ss^*} = \mathcal{C}_0(ss^*)$. Using the definitions (7.5) and (7.6) and the (easily verified) relation $\tau(\gamma^{-1},\gamma) = \tau(\gamma,\gamma^{-1})$, and using the canonical identification $\mathcal{C}_0(L_{s^*s}) \cong \mathcal{C}_0(s^*s)$ to view a as a continuous section of L_{s^*s}, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_s(a)(\mathrm{r}(\gamma)) &= (u_s a u_s^*)(\gamma\mathrm{d}(\gamma)\gamma^{-1}) = u_s(\gamma)\cdot a(\mathrm{d}(\gamma))\cdot u_s(\gamma)^* \\
&= (1,\gamma)\cdot(a(\mathrm{d}(\gamma)),\mathrm{d}(\gamma))\cdot(1,\gamma)^* \\
&= (a(\mathrm{d}(\gamma))\tau(\gamma,\mathrm{d}(\gamma)),\gamma)\cdot(\overline{\tau(\gamma^{-1},\gamma)},\gamma^{-1}) \\
&= (a(\mathrm{d}(\gamma))\overline{\tau(\gamma^{-1},\gamma)}\tau(\gamma,\gamma^{-1}),\mathrm{d}(\gamma)) = a(\mathrm{d}(\gamma)).
\end{aligned}$$

To yield the relation between the cocycles $\omega(s,t)$ and $\tau(\alpha,\beta)$, first observe that $\omega(s,t)$ is a unitary element of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{b}}(stt^*s^*) \cong \mathcal{C}_0(L_{stt^*s^*})$, that is, a continuous function $\omega(s,t)\colon stt^*s^* \to \mathbb{T}$. Now, since s,t are bisections, every element of stt^*s^* can be uniquely written as $\alpha\beta\beta^{-1}\alpha^{-1} = \mathrm{r}(\alpha\beta)$ for $\alpha\in s$ and $\beta\in t$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(s,t)(\mathrm{r}(\alpha\beta)) &= (u_s u_t u_{st}^*)(\alpha\beta\beta^{-1}\alpha^{-1}) \\
&= u_s(\alpha)\cdot u_t(\beta)\cdot u_{st}(\alpha\beta)^* \\
&= (1,\alpha)\cdot(1,\beta)\cdot(1,\alpha\beta)^* \\
&= (\tau(\alpha,\beta),\alpha\beta)\cdot(\overline{\tau((\alpha\beta)^{-1},\alpha\beta)},(\alpha\beta)^{-1}) \\
&= (\tau(\alpha,\beta)\overline{\tau((\alpha\beta)^{-1},\alpha\beta)}\tau(\alpha\beta,(\alpha\beta)^{-1}),\alpha\beta\beta^{-1}\alpha^{-1}) \\
&= (\tau(\alpha,\beta),\mathrm{r}(\alpha\beta)) = \tau(\alpha,\beta).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Summarizing the results of this section, we have seen how to describe twisted étale groupoids in terms of inverse semigroup twisted actions. While the 2-cocycles on groupoids can only describe topologically trivial twisted groupoids, our twists have not such a limitation and allow us to describe arbitrary twisted étale groupoids. As we have seen above, the topologically trivial twisted étale groupoids essentially correspond to Sieben's twisted actions, a special case of our theory.

8. Refinements of Fell bundles

In this section, we introduce a notion of *refinement* for Fell bundles and prove that several constructions from Fell bundles, including cross-sectional C^*-algebras and twisted groupoids (in the semi-abelian case), are preserved under refinements. Our main point in this section is to prove that locally regular Fell bundles admit a regular, saturated refinement. This puts every locally regular Fell bundle into the setting of Section 3 and enables us to describe it as a twisted action.

Definition 8.1. Let S, T be inverse semigroups and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t\in T}$ be Fell bundles. A *morphism* from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ is a pair (ϕ, ψ), where $\phi\colon T \to S$ is a semigroup homomorphism, and $\psi\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ is a map satisfying:

(i) $\psi(\mathcal{B}_t) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$ and the restriction $\psi_t\colon \mathcal{B}_t \to \mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$ is a linear map;
(ii) ψ respects product and involution: $\psi(ab) = \psi(a)\psi(b)$ and $\psi(a^*) = \psi(a)^*$, for all $a, b \in \mathcal{B}$;
(iii) ψ commutes with the inclusion maps: whenever $t \leq t'$ in T, we get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B}_t & \xrightarrow{j^{\mathcal{B}}_{t',t}} & \mathcal{B}_{t'} \\ {\scriptstyle\psi_t}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\psi_{t'}} \\ \mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)} & \xrightarrow[j^{\mathcal{A}}_{\phi(t'),\phi(t)}]{} & \mathcal{A}_{\phi(t')} \end{array}$$

We say that $\mathcal{B}$ is a *refinement* of $\mathcal{A}$ if there is a morphism (ϕ, ψ) from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ with $\phi\colon T \to S$ surjective and *essentially injective* in the sense that $\phi(t) \in E(S)$ implies $t \in E(T)$, with $\psi_t\colon \mathcal{B}_t \to \mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$ injective for all $t \in T$, and such that

$$\mathcal{A}_s = \overline{\sum_{t\in\phi^{-1}(s)} \psi(\mathcal{B}_t)} \quad \text{for all } s \in S. \tag{8.2}$$

Remark 8.3. **(1)** If $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t\in T}$ is a refinement of $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ via some morphism (ϕ, ψ), then $\psi(\mathcal{B}_t)$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$ (as ternary rings of operators) for all $t \in T$ (see comments before Definition 2.8). In fact, it is enough to check that $\psi(\mathcal{B}_f)$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{A}_e$ for every idempotent $f \in T$ with $\phi(f) = e$. Equation (8.2) implies

$$\mathcal{A}_e = \overline{\sum_{\phi(g)=e} \psi(\mathcal{B}_g)}.$$

Since ϕ is essentially injective, each $g \in T$ with $\phi(g) = e$ is necessarily idempotent. Hence,

$$\psi(\mathcal{B}_f)\mathcal{A}_e = \overline{\sum_{\phi(g)=e} \psi(\mathcal{B}_f)\psi(\mathcal{B}_g)} = \overline{\sum_{\phi(g)=e} \psi(\mathcal{B}_f\mathcal{B}_g)} \subseteq \overline{\sum_{\phi(g)=e} \psi(\mathcal{B}_{fg})}.$$

Given $g \in E(T)$ with $\phi(g) = e$, we have $fg \leq f$. Definition 8.1(iii) yields

$$\psi(\mathcal{B}_{fg}) = j^{\mathcal{A}}_{e,e}\big(\psi(\mathcal{B}_{fg})\big) = \psi\big(j^{\mathcal{B}}_{f,fg}(\mathcal{B}_{fg})\big) \subseteq \psi(\mathcal{B}_f).$$

It follows that $\psi(\mathcal{B}_f)\mathcal{A}_e \subseteq \psi(\mathcal{B}_f)$. Similarly, $\mathcal{A}_e\psi(\mathcal{B}_f) \subseteq \psi(\mathcal{B}_f)$.

(2) In the realm of (discrete) groups the notion of refinement is not interesting. Indeed, if S, T are groups and $\phi\colon T \to S$ is an essentially injective, surjective homomorphism, then is it is automatically an isomorphism because the only idempotents are the group identities. Hence for groups S, T and Fell bundles $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ over S and T, respectively, a refinement (ϕ, ψ) from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ is the same as an isomorphism $(\phi, \psi)\colon (T, \mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\sim} (S, \mathcal{A})$. However, we may have a Fell bundle $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ over a group S, and an interesting refinement $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t\in T}$ allowing T to be an inverse semigroup. For instance, we are going to prove (Proposition 8.6) that every Fell bundle admits a saturated refinement and this can, of course, be applied to Fell bundle over groups, but one has to allow the refinement itself to be a Fell bundle over an inverse semigroup.

First, we show that refinements preserve the Fell bundle cross-sectional C^*-algebras (see [9] for details on the construction of these algebras).

Theorem 8.4. *Let $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t\in T}$ be a refinement of $\{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ through a morphism (ϕ, ψ), and let $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A}$ be the restrictions of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ to the idempotent parts of T and S, respectively. Then there is a (unique) isomorphism $\Psi\colon C^*(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\sim} C^*(\mathcal{A})$ satisfying $\Psi(b) = \psi(b)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Here we view each fiber $\mathcal{B}_t$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_s$) as a subspace of $C^*(\mathcal{B})$ (resp. $C^*(\mathcal{A})$) via the universal representation. Moreover, Ψ factors through an isomorphism $C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\sim} C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{A})$ and restricts to an isomorphism $\Psi|\colon C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\sim} C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})$*

Proof. Since (ϕ, ψ) is a morphism from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, it induces a (unique) *-homomorphism $\Psi\colon C^*(\mathcal{B}) \to C^*(\mathcal{A})$ satisfying $\Psi(b) = \psi(b)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Moreover, it also induces a map from $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ to $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$ (the classes of representations of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, respectively) that takes $\pi \in \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ and associates the representation $\tilde{\pi} := \pi \circ \psi \in \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$. All this holds for any morphism of Fell bundles. Now, to prove that the induced map Ψ is an isomorphism, we need to use the extra properties of refinement. The surjectivity of Ψ follows from Equation (8.2). In fact, this equation implies that Ψ has dense image, and since any *-homomorphism between C^*-algebras has closed image, the surjectivity of Ψ follows. To show that Ψ is injective, it is enough to show that any representation $\rho \in \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$ has the form $\rho = \tilde{\pi}$ for some representation $\pi \in \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ (necessarily unique by Equation (8.2)). Given $\rho \in \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$ and $s \in S$, we define

$$\pi_s(b) := \sum_{t\in\phi^{-1}(s)} \rho(b_t),$$

whenever $b \in \mathcal{A}_s$ is a finite sum of the form

$$b = \sum_{t\in\phi^{-1}(s)} \psi(b_t)$$

with all but finitely many non-zero b_t's in $\mathcal{B}_t$. All we have to show is that π_s is well-defined and extends to $\mathcal{A}_s$. Since $\mathcal{A}_s$ is the closure of b's as above, it is enough to show that

$$\left\| \sum_{t\in\phi^{-1}(s)} \rho(b_t) \right\| \leq \|b\|.$$

First, note that

$$\|b\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{t,r\in\phi^{-1}(s)} \psi(b_t^* b_r) \right\|.$$

Given $t, s \in \phi^{-1}(s)$, we have $\phi(t^*r) = s^*s$, and because ϕ is essentially injective, this implies that t^*r is idempotent. Consequently, we may view $\sum_{t,r\in\phi^{-1}(s)} b_t^* b_r$ as an element of $C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B})$. Using [9, Proposition 4.3], it is easy to see that the *-homomorphism $\Psi\colon C^*(\mathcal{B}) \to C^*(\mathcal{A})$ is injective (hence isometric) on $C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B})$. Therefore,

$$\|b\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{t,r\in\phi^{-1}(s)} \psi(b_t^* b_r) \right\| = \left\| \psi\left(\sum_{t,r\in\phi^{-1}(s)} b_t^* b_r \right) \right\|$$
$$= \left\| \sum_{t,r\in\phi^{-1}(s)} b_t^* b_r \right\| \geq \left\| \sum_{t,r\in\phi^{-1}(s)} \rho(b_t^* b_r) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{t\in\phi^{-1}(s)} \rho(b_t) \right\|^2 .$$

Thus π_s is well defined and extends to a (obviously linear) map $\pi_s\colon \mathcal{A}_s \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$. Since s is arbitrary, we get a map $\pi\colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ which is easily seen to be a representation because ρ is. And, of course, we have $\tilde{\pi} = \rho$. This shows that Ψ is injective and, therefore, an isomorphism $C^*(\mathcal{B}) \to C^*(\mathcal{A})$. It is clear that it restricts to an isomorphism $\Psi|\colon C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B}) \to C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})$.

Finally, we show that Ψ factors through an isomorphism $C^*_{\rm r}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\sim} C^*_{\rm r}(\mathcal{A})$. First, let us recall that the reduced cross-sectional C^*-algebra $C^*_{\rm r}(\mathcal{A})$ is the image of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ by the regular representation $\Lambda_\mathcal{A}\colon C^*(\mathcal{A}) \to C^*_{\rm r}(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ (see [9, Proposition 8.6]), which is defined as the direct sum of all GNS-representations associated to states $\tilde{\varphi}$ of $C^*(\mathcal{A})$, where φ runs over the set of all pure states of $C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})$ and $\tilde{\varphi}$ is the canonical extension of φ as defined in [9, Section 7]. Of course, the same is true for the regular representation $\Lambda_\mathcal{B}\colon C^*(\mathcal{B}) \to C^*_{\rm r}(\mathcal{B})$ of $\mathcal{B}$. Since $\Psi|\colon C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B}) \to C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})$ is an isomorphism, the assignment $\varphi \mapsto \varphi \circ \Psi|$ defines a bijective correspondence between pure states of $C^*(\mathcal{E}_A)$ and $C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B})$. To prove that Ψ factors through an isomorphism $C^*_{\rm r}(\mathcal{B}) \to C^*_{\rm r}(\mathcal{A})$ it is enough to show that the canonical extension of $\varphi \circ \Psi|$ coincides with $\tilde{\varphi} \circ \Psi$, that is, $\widetilde{\varphi \circ \Psi|} = \tilde{\varphi} \circ \Psi$ for all pure states φ of $C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})$. Let $t \in T$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}_t$. According to Proposition 7.4(i) in [9], we have two cases to consider:

Case 1. Assume there is an idempotent $f \in E(T)$ lying in $\mathrm{supp}(\varphi \circ \Psi|)$, the support of $\varphi \circ \Psi|$ (see [9, Definition 7.1]), with $f \leq t$. Let $e := \phi(f)$ and $s := \phi(t)$. Note that $e \leq s$. Moreover, since $\Psi|\colon C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B}) \to C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})$ is an isomorphism and $\varphi \circ \Psi|$ is supported on $\mathcal{B}_f$, it follows that φ is supported on $\psi(\mathcal{B}_f)$ and hence on $\mathcal{A}_e$ (by [9, Proposition 5.3]) because $\psi(\mathcal{B}_f)$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{A}_e$ by Remark 8.3(1). This implies that if (u_i) is an approximate unit for $\mathcal{B}_f$, then

$$\lim_i \varphi\big(\psi(b)\psi(u_i)\big) = \tilde{\varphi}^s_e(\psi(b)).$$

Here use the same notation of [9] and write φ_e for the restriction of φ to $\mathcal{A}_e$ and $\tilde{\varphi}^s_e$ for the canonical extension of φ_e to $\mathcal{A}_s$ (see [9, Proposition 6.1]). It follows that

$$\widetilde{\varphi \circ \Psi|}(b) = \big(\widetilde{\varphi \circ \Psi|}\big)^t_f(b) = \lim_i (\varphi \circ \Psi|)(bu_i)$$
$$= \lim_i \varphi\big(\psi(b)\psi(u_i)\big) = \tilde{\varphi}^s_e(\psi(b)) = \tilde{\varphi}\big(\psi(b)\big) = (\tilde{\varphi} \circ \Psi)(b).$$

Case 2. Suppose there is no $f \in \mathrm{supp}(\varphi \circ \Psi|)$ with $f \leq t$. In this case, we have $\widetilde{\varphi \circ \Psi|}(b) = 0$ by [9, Proposition 7.4(i)]. If, on the other hand, there is no $e \in \mathrm{supp}(\varphi)$ with $e \leq s := \phi(t)$, then we also have $(\tilde{\varphi} \circ \Psi)(b) = 0$. Assume there is $e \in \mathrm{supp}(\varphi)$ such that $e \leq s$. Since ϕ is surjective, there is $g \in E(T)$ with $\phi(g) = e$. Since $\phi(tg) = se = e$, we have $tg \in E(T)$ because ϕ is essentially injective. Note that $tg \leq t$. By assumption, $tg \notin \mathrm{supp}(\varphi \circ \Psi|)$, so that $(\varphi \circ \Psi|)(\mathcal{B}_{tg}) = \{0\}$ by

[9, Proposition 5.5]. Let (v_j) be an approximate unit for $\mathcal{A}_e$. Then

$$(\tilde{\varphi}\circ\Psi)(b) = \tilde{\varphi}^s_e(\psi(b)) = \lim_j \varphi(\psi(b)v_j). \tag{8.5}$$

By (8.2), $\mathcal{A}_e$ is the closed linear span of $\psi(\mathcal{B}_g)$ with $\phi(g) = e$. Thus each $v \in \mathcal{A}_e$ is a limit of finite sums of the form $\sum \psi(u_n)$ with $u_n \in \mathcal{B}_{g_n}$, where $g_n \in E(T)$ and $\phi(g_n) = e$. Since $(\varphi\circ\Psi|)(\mathcal{B}_{tg_n}) = \{0\}$, we have $\varphi(\psi(bu_n)) = 0$ for all n. It follows that $\varphi(\psi(b)v) = 0$ for all $v \in \mathcal{A}_e$ and hence Equation (8.5) yields $(\tilde{\varphi}\circ\Psi)(b) = 0$.

Therefore, in any case we have $\widetilde{\varphi\circ\Psi|}(b) = \tilde{\varphi}\circ\Psi(b)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and hence for all $b \in C^*(\mathcal{B})$, and this concludes the proof. □

Next, we show that any locally regular Fell bundle admits a regular, saturated refinement.

Proposition 8.6. *(a) Every Fell bundle admits a saturated refinement.*
(b) Every locally regular Fell bundle admits a regular, saturated refinement.
(c) If a Fell bundle admits a regular refinement, then it is locally regular.

Proof. (a) Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ be a Fell bundle over an inverse semigroup S. We may assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a concrete Fell bundle in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and the C^*-algebras $B = C^*(\mathcal{E})$ and $A = C^*(\mathcal{A})$ are all realized as operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ for some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Consider the set S_B of all ternary ring of operators $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H)$ satisfying

$$MB, BM \subseteq M \quad \text{and} \quad M^*M, MM^* \subseteq B. \tag{8.7}$$

Note that S_B is an inverse semigroup with respect to the multiplication $M \cdot N := MN = \overline{\operatorname{span}}(MN)$. In fact, first we have to show that the multiplication is well-defined. For this, take $M, N \in S_B$. It is easy to see that MN satisfies (8.7). To see that MN is again a ternary ring of operators, observe that $I = M^*M$ and $J = NN^*$ are ideals in B, and ideals of any C^*-algebra always commute as sets ($IJ = I \cap J = JI$). Hence

$$(MN)(MN)^*(MN) = M(NN^*)(M^*M)N = M(M^*M)(NN^*)N = MN.$$

Thus MN is a ternary ring of operators. Now, because each $M \in S_B$ is a ternary ring of operators, we have $MM^*M = M$ and $M^* = M^*MM^*$. Thus M^* is an inverse of M in S_B. To show the uniqueness of inverses, it suffices to show that idempotents commute (see Theorem 3 in [14, Chapter 1]). Let $M \in S_B$ be an idempotent, that is, $M^2 = MM = M$. We have $M^* = M^*MM^* = (M^*M)(MM^*) = (MM^*)(M^*M) = MM^*M^*M = MM^*M = M$. Thus, idempotents of S_B have the form M^*M with $M \in S_B$, and these commute because they are ideals of B. Hence S_B is an inverse semigroup.

Observe that each $M = \mathcal{A}_s$ is a ternary ring of operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ that satisfies $MB, BM \subseteq M$ and $M^*M, MM^* \subseteq B$ so that $\mathcal{A}_s \in S_B$. Consider

$$T := \{(s, M) \in S \times S_B \colon M \subseteq \mathcal{A}_s\}.$$

Note that T is an inverse sub-semigroup of $S \times S_B$ and we have a canonical surjective homomorphism $\phi\colon T \to S$ given by the projection onto the first coordinate. Moreover, ϕ is essentially injective. Indeed, suppose that $\phi(e, M) = e$ is idempotent in S. Since $(e, M) \in T$, we have $M \subseteq \mathcal{A}_e$. Thus

$$\mathcal{A}_eM^*M \subseteq \mathcal{A}_e\mathcal{A}_e^*M = \mathcal{A}_eM \subseteq M = MM^*M \subseteq \mathcal{A}_eM^*M.$$

Therefore $\mathcal{A}_eM^*M = M$ and because M^*M is an ideal of $\mathcal{A}_e$ we have $\mathcal{A}_eM^*M = M^*M$, that is, $M = M^*M$ is an idempotent of S_B. We conclude that (e, M) is an idempotent in T, whence ϕ is essentially injective.

Now we define a Fell bundle $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t\in T}$ over T with fibers $\mathcal{B}_t := M$ whenever $t = (s, M)$. Notice that the order relation in S_B is just the inclusion, that is, $M \leq N$

in S_B if and only if $M \subseteq N$. In fact, if $M \leq N$, then $M = NM^*M \subseteq NB \subseteq N$. And if $M \subseteq N$, then

$$NM^*M \subseteq NN^*M \subseteq BM \subseteq M = MM^*M \subseteq NM^*M,$$

so that $NM^*M = M$, that is, $M \leq N$. This allows us to define inclusion maps $j_{t',t} \colon \mathcal{B}_t \to \mathcal{B}_{t'}$ for $\mathcal{B}$ whenever $t \leq t'$ in T. Of course, the algebraic operations of $\mathcal{B}$ are inherited from $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. With this structure, $\mathcal{B}$ is a saturated Fell bundle over T. Moreover, by construction, it is a concrete Fell bundle in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and we have $\mathcal{B}_t \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$ for all $t \in T$. Thus, we get a canonical map $\psi \colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ whose restriction to $\mathcal{B}_t$ is the inclusion $\mathcal{B}_t \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$. The pair (ϕ, ψ) is a morphism from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ and through this morphism $\mathcal{B}$ is a refinement of $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore every Fell bundle has a saturated refinement.

(b) Now we assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is locally regular. Then we redefine S_B of part (a) taking only the *regular* ternary ring of operators $M \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying (8.7). If M, N are regular ternary ring of operators, there are $u \in M$ and $v \in N$ with $u \sim M$ and $v \sim N$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} uv(MN)^*(MN) = uvN^*M^*MN = u(NN^*)(M^*M)N \\ = u(M^*M)(NN^*)N = MN. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, $(MN)(MN)^*uv = MN$, so that $uv \sim MN$ and therefore MN is a regular ternary ring of operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. It follows that S_B is also an inverse semigroup. With the same definition for T, $\mathcal{B}$ and (ϕ, ψ) as above, we get the desired regular refinement of $\mathcal{A}$. In fact, by construction, $\mathcal{B}$ is a regular, saturated Fell bundle which is a refinement of $\mathcal{A}$ through the morphism (ϕ, ψ). The only non-trivial axiom to be checked is (8.2). But this follows from the definition of local regularity.

(c) If $\mathcal{A}$ has a regular refinement $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t \in T}$ via some morphism (ϕ, ψ), then each $\psi(\mathcal{B}_t)$ is a regular ideal in $\mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$ (see Remark 8.3(1)) and therefore $\mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$ is locally regular by (8.2). Since ϕ is surjective, this shows that $\mathcal{A}_s$ is locally regular for all $s \in S$, that is, $\mathcal{A}$ is locally regular. □

Observe that Theorem 8.4 and Proposition 8.6 enable us to apply our main results to every (not necessarily saturated) locally regular Fell bundle $\mathcal{A}$ and describe their cross-sectional C^*-algebras $C^*(\mathcal{A})$ and $C^*_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathcal{A})$ as (full or reduced) twisted crossed products.

Remark 8.8. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s \in G}$ be a regular (not necessarily saturated) Fell bundle over a (discrete) group G. By Theorem 7.3 in [7], this corresponds to a *twisted partial action* (α, υ) of G on the unit fiber $A := \mathcal{A}_1$. On the other hand, applying Proposition 8.6, and taking a saturated, regular refinement $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t \in T}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ (here T is an inverse semigroup), we may describe the same system as a twisted action of T. More precisely, by Corollary 4.16, there is a twisted action (β, ω) of T on $C^*(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}) \cong A$ (by Theorem 8.4) such that the crossed product $A \rtimes^{(\mathrm{r})}_{\beta,\omega} T \cong C^*_{(\mathrm{r})}(\mathcal{B})$ is (again by Theorem 8.4) isomorphic to the crossed product $A \rtimes^{(\mathrm{r})}_{\alpha,\upsilon} G \cong C^*_{(\mathrm{r})}(\mathcal{A})$.

By the way, it should be also possible to define *twisted partial actions* of inverse semigroups, generalizing at the same time our Definition 4.1 of twisted action and that of [7, Definition 2.1] for groups. As in our main result (Corollary 4.16), twisted partial actions should correspond to regular (not necessarily saturated) Fell bundles. However, the (full or reduced) cross-sectional C^*-algebra of any such Fell bundle can also be described as a (full or reduced) crossed product by some twisted action in our sense (again by Theorem 8.4 and Proposition 8.6). This is the reason why we have chosen not to consider twisted partial actions.

Recall from [3] that a Fell bundle $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$ is called *semi-abelian* if the fibers $\mathcal{A}_e$ are commutative C^*-algebras for every idempotent $e \in S$.

Corollary 8.9. *Every semi-abelian Fell bundle has a regular, saturated* (*necessarily semi-abelian*) *refinement.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.9, every semi-abelian Fell bundle is locally regular. Hence the assertion follows from Proposition 8.6 □

In [3] we have shown that there is a close relationship between saturated, semi-abelian Fell bundles and twisted étale groupoids, or equivalently, Fell line bundles over étale groupoids. The following result shows that the twisted étale groupoids associated to semi-abelian Fell bundles are not changed under refinements:

Proposition 8.10. *If $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t\in T}$ is a saturated refinement of a saturated, semi-abelian Fell bundle $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_s\}_{s\in S}$, then the twisted étale groupoids associated to $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ as in* [3, Section 3.2] *are isomorphic.*

Proof. During the proof we shall write $(\mathcal{G}, L)$ and $(\mathcal{G}', L')$ for the twisted groupoids associated to $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, respectively, as constructed in [3, Section 3.2]. Here $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ are étale groupoids and L and L' are Fell line bundles over $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$, respectively. Let (ϕ, ψ) be the morphism from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ that gives $\mathcal{B}$ as a refinement of $\mathcal{A}$ as in Definition 8.1. The map $\psi\colon \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}$ preserves all the algebraic operations and inclusion maps of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ and restricts to an injective map $\mathcal{B}_t \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$ for all $t \in T$. So, we may suppress ψ and identify each $\mathcal{B}_t$ as a closed subspace of $\mathcal{A}_{\phi(t)}$. By Theorem 8.4, these inclusions extend to the level of C^*-algebras yielding an isomorphism $C^*(\mathcal{B}) \cong C^*(\mathcal{A})$ which restricts to an isomorphism of the underlying commutative C^*-algebras $C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B})$ and $C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})$. Let us say that $C^*(\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B}) \cong C^*(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathcal{C}_0(X)$ for some locally compact space X. Through these identifications, $\mathcal{B}_f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_e \subseteq \mathcal{C}_0(X)$ becomes an inclusion of ideals whenever $e \in E(S)$, $f \in E(T)$ and $\phi(f) = e$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{A}_e = \overline{\sum_{f\in\phi^{-1}(e)} \mathcal{B}_f} \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \mathcal{U}_e = \bigcup_{f\in\phi^{-1}(e)} \mathcal{U}_f, \tag{8.11}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_e$ is the open subset of X that corresponds to the ideal $\mathcal{A}_e \subseteq \mathcal{C}_0(X)$, that is, $\mathcal{A}_e = \mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{U}_e)$. By definition, the $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ are groupoid of germs for certain canonical actions θ and θ' of T and S on X, respectively (see [3, Proposition 3.5] for the precise definition). We shall use the same notation as in [3] and write elements of $\mathcal{G}$ as equivalence classes $[t, x]$ of pairs (t, x) where $t \in T$ and $x \in \operatorname{dom}(\theta_t) = \mathcal{U}_{t^*t}$, and elements of L as equivalence classes $[b, t, x]$ of triples (b, t, x) with $b \in \mathcal{B}_t$ and $x \in \operatorname{dom}(b) = \{y \in X\colon (b^*b)(y) > 0\}$. See [3, Section 3.2] for further details. Of course, we also use similar notations for elements of $\mathcal{G}'$ and L'. Now, consider the maps $\Phi\colon \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}'$ and $\Psi\colon L \to L'$ defined by $\Phi[t, y] = [\phi(t), y]$ and $\Psi[b, t, y] = [\psi(b), \phi(t), y]$. We are going to show that these maps give us the desired isomorphism $(\mathcal{G}, L) \cong (\mathcal{G}', L')$. It is easy to see that the definition of Φ and Ψ do not depend on representant choices for the equivalence classes, that is, Φ and Ψ are well-defined maps. Since ϕ is surjective, so is Φ. By [3, Proposition 3.5], $\theta_t\colon \mathcal{U}_{t^*t} \to \mathcal{U}_{tt^*}$ is the union of the partial homeomorphisms θ_b with $b \in \mathcal{B}_t$ defined in [3, Lemma 3.3]. Of course, the same holds for the partial homeomorphisms $\theta'_s\colon \mathcal{U}_{s^*s} \to \mathcal{U}_{ss^*}$, $s \in S$, associated to the Fell bundle $\mathcal{A}$. By (8.2), each θ'_s is the union of the partial homeomorphisms θ_t with $t \in \phi^{-1}(s)$. This implies that Ψ is surjective. To show that Φ is injective, suppose that $[t, y], [t', y] \in \mathcal{G}$ and $[\phi(t), y] = [\phi(t'), y]$ in $\mathcal{G}'$, that is, there is $e \in E(S)$ such that $y \in \mathcal{U}_e$ and $\phi(t)e = \phi(t')e$. Equation (8.11) yields $f \in E(T)$ such that $y \in \mathcal{U}_f$ and $\phi(f) = e$. Thus $\phi(t_1) = \phi(t_2)$, where $t_1 = tf$

and $t_2 = t'f$. Since ϕ is essentially injective, $g := t_1^* t_2$ belongs to $E(T)$. Note that $t_1 g = h t_2$, where $h := t_1 t_1^* \in E(T)$. Moreover,

$$ht_2 = ht_2 t_2^* t_2 = t_2 t_2^* h t_2 = t_2(t_2^* t_1)(t_1^* t_2) = t_2 g^* g = t_2 g.$$

Hence $t_1 g = t_2 g$ and since $y \in \mathcal{U}_{t_1^* t_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{t_2^* t_2}$ and $g = t_1^* t_2$ is idempotent, it follows that $y \in \mathcal{U}_g$ (see proof of [3, Lemma 3.4]). We conclude that $tfg = t'fg$ and $y \in \mathcal{U}_f \cap \mathcal{U}_g = \mathcal{U}_{fg}$, so that $[t, y] = [t', y]$. This shows that Φ is injective. We now prove that Ψ injective. Assume that $[\psi(b), \phi(t), y] = [\psi(b'), \phi(t'), y]$ in L', that is, there is $c, c' \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $c(y), c'(y) > 0$ and $\psi(b)c = \psi(b')c'$. Equation (8.11) implies the existence of $d, d' \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}$ with $c = \psi(d)$ and $c' = \psi(d')$. Since ψ induces the isomorphism $C^*(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}) \cong C^*(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}) \cong \mathcal{C}_0(X)$, we must have $d(y), d'(y) > 0$. Let $a := bd$ and $a' := b'd'$. Then $a \in \mathcal{B}_s$, $a' \in \mathcal{B}_{s'}$ for some $s, s' \in T$, and we have $\psi(a) = \psi(a')$. Note that $[a, s, y] = [b, t, y]$ and $[a', s', y] = [b', t', y]$. The injectivity of Ψ will follow if we show that $[a, s, y] = [a', s', y]$. By definition of refinement, ψ is injective when restricted to the fibers of $\mathcal{B}$. The only small problem is that a and a' might not be in the same fiber. However we may circumvent this problem: suppose that $a \in \mathcal{A}_t$ and $a' \in \mathcal{A}_{t'}$. Since $\psi(a) = \psi(a')$, $\psi(a) \in \mathcal{B}_{\phi(t)}$ and $\psi(a') \in \mathcal{B}_{\phi(t')}$, we must have $\phi(t) = \phi(t')$. Hence $\Phi([t, y]) = \Phi([t', y])$. The (already checked) injectivity of Φ yields $f \in E(T)$ with $y \in \mathcal{U}_f$ and $r := tf = t'f$. Now take any function $a_f \in \mathcal{B}_f = \mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{U}_f)$ with $a_f(y) > 0$. Note that $[a, r, y] = [aa_f, r, y]$, $[a', r', y] = [a'a_f, r, y]$ and $\psi(aa_f) = \psi(a'a_f)$. Since now both $aa_f, a'a_f \in \mathcal{B}_r$ the injectivity of $\psi_r \colon \mathcal{B}_r \to \mathcal{A}_{\phi(r)}$ implies that $aa_f = a'a_f$. Therefore $[a, t, y] = [a', t', y]$, whence the injectivity of Ψ follows.

It is easy to see that $\Phi \colon \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}'$ and $\Psi \colon L \to L'$ preserve all the algebraic operations involved. Moreover, Φ and Ψ are homeomorphisms: given $t \in T$ and an open subset $U \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{t^*t}$, the basic neighborhood $\mathcal{O}(t, U) = \{[s, y] \colon y \in U\}$ in $\mathcal{G}$ (see Equation (3.6) in [3]) is mapped by Φ to the basic neighborhood $\mathcal{O}(s, U)$ in $\mathcal{G}'$, where $s = \phi(t)$ (note that $\mathcal{U}_{t^*t} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{s^*s}$). Moreover, since any $\mathcal{U}_e$ with $e \in E(S)$ is the union of $\{\mathcal{U}_f \colon f \in \phi^{-1}(e)\}$, the neighborhoods of the form $\mathcal{O}(s, U)$ with $s = \phi(t)$ and U an open subset of $\mathcal{U}_{t^*t}$, generate the topology of $\mathcal{G}'$. This implies that Φ is a homeomorphism. To prove that Ψ is a homeomorphism, we apply [10, Proposition II.13.17]. For this it is enough to check that Ψ is continuous and isometric on the fibers. But, since L and L' are both Fell bundles, the injectivity of Ψ (already checked above) implies that it is isometric. To see that Ψ is continuous, let us recall from [3, Proposition 3.25] that the topology on L is generated by the local sections $\hat{b}[t, y] := [b, t, y]$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}_t$, and similarly for L'. Now the continuity of Ψ follows from the equality $\Psi \circ \hat{b} = \widehat{\psi(b)} \circ \Phi$.

The bundle projections $\pi \colon L \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ and $\pi' \colon L' \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{G}'$ are defined by $\pi[b, t, y] = [t, y]$ and $\pi'[a, s, x] = [s, x]$. From this, it is clear that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{G} \\ {\scriptstyle\Psi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\Phi} \\ L' & \xrightarrow[\pi']{} & \mathcal{G}' \end{array}$$

Therefore, the pair $(\Phi, \Psi) \colon (\mathcal{G}, L) \to (\mathcal{G}', L')$ is an isomorphism of Fell bundles. □

The semi-abelian Fell bundle associated to a twisted étale groupoid as in [3] is automatically saturated. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a non-saturated, semi-abelian Fell bundle, we may apply Corollary 8.9 to find a saturated, semi-abelian refinement $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and then apply the results of [3] to find the associated twisted étale groupoid $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma)$. By Theorem 8.4 and Propositions 2.18 and 3.40 in [3], we have isomorphisms

$$C^*_{(\mathrm{r})}(\mathcal{A}) \cong C^*_{(\mathrm{r})}(\mathcal{B}) \cong C^*_{(\mathrm{r})}(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma).$$

For the isomorphism between the full C^*-algebras above it is necessary to assume that $\mathcal{G}$ is Hausdorff or second countable because this is part of the hypothesis in [3, Propositions 2.18].

References

[1] Lawrence G. Brown, Philip Green, and Marc A. Rieffel, *Stable isomorphism and strong Morita equivalence of C^*-algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **71** (1977), no. 2, 349–363.

[2] Robert C. Busby and Harvey A. Smith, *Representations of twisted group algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **149** (1970), 503–537.

[3] Alcides Buss and Ruy Exel, *Fell bundles over inverse semigroups and twisted étale groupoids*, Preprint (to appear in Journal of Operator Theory) (2009). arXiv:0903.3388.

[4] Valentin Deaconu, Alex Kumjian, and Birant Ramazan, *Fell bundles associated to groupoid morphisms*, Math. Scand. **102** (2008), no. 2, 305–319.

[5] M. Dokuchaev, R. Exel, and J. J. Simón, *Crossed products by twisted partial actions and graded algebras*, J. Algebra **320** (2008), no. 8, 3278–3310.

[6] Siegfried Echterhoff, Steven P. Kaliszewski, John Quigg, and Iain Raeburn, *A categorical approach to imprimitivity theorems for C^*-dynamical systems*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **180** (2006), no. 850, viii+169.

[7] Ruy Exel, *Twisted partial actions, a classification of regular C^*-algebraic bundles*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **74** (1997), 417-443.

[8] ———, *Inverse semigroups and combinatorial C^*-algebras*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **39** (2008), no. 2, 191–313. MR 2419901

[9] ———, *Noncommutative cartan sub-algebras of C^*-algebras*, Preprint (2008).

[10] James M.G. Fell and Robert S. Doran, *Representations of *-Algebras, Locally Compact Groups, and Banach *-Algebraic Bundles Vol.1*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 126, Academic Press Inc., 1988. MR 936628

[11] Mahmood and Skandalis Khoshkam Georges, *Crossed products of C^*-algebras by groupoids and inverse semigroups*, J. Operator Theory **51** (2004), no. 2, 255–279.

[12] Alexander Kumjian, *On C^*-diagonals*, Can. J. Math. **XXXVIII** (1986), no. 4, 969-1008.

[13] ———, *Fell bundles over groupoids*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **126** (1998), no. 4, 1115-1125.

[14] Mark V. Lawson, *Inverse semigroups: the theory of partial symmetries*, World Scientific Publishing Co., River Edge, NJ, 1998.

[15] Paul S. Muhly and Dana P. Williams, *Continuous trace groupoid C^*-algebras. II*, Math. Scand. **70** (1992), no. 1, 127–145.

[16] Judith A. Packer and Iain Raeburn, *Twisted crossed products of C^*-algebras*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **106** (1989), 293–311.

[17] Alan L. T. Paterson, *Groupoids, inverse semigroups, and their operator algebras*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 170, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.

[18] John Quigg and Nándor Sieben, *C^*-actions of r-discrete groupoids and inverse semigroups*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. **66** (1999), no. Series A, 143-167.

[19] Iain Raeburn, *On the Picard group of a continuous trace C^*-algebra*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **263** (1981), no. 1, 183–205.

[20] Jean Renault, *A groupoid approach to C^*-algebras*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 793, Springer, Berlin, 1980.

[21] ———, *Cartan subalgebras in C^*-algebras*, Irish Math. Soc. Bull. **61** (2008), 29–63.

[22] Mikael Rørdam, *Extensions of stable C^*-algebras*, Doc. Math. **6** (2001), 241–246 (electronic).

[23] Nándor Sieben, *C^*-crossed products by twisted inverse semigroup actions*, J. Operator Theory **39** (1998), no. 2, 361–393.

[24] Nándor Sieben, *Fell bundles over r-discrete groupoids and inverse semigroups*, Unpublished preprint (1998). http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~ns46/bundle.ps.gz.

[25] Heinrich Zettl, *A characterization of ternary rings of operators*, Adv. in Math. **48** (1983), no. 2, 117–143.

E-mail address: alcides@mtm.ufsc.br

E-mail address: exel@mtm.ufsc.br

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, 88.040-900 Florianópolis-SC, Brasil